IN REPLY REFER TO
1608
(N-056)

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Las Vegas District Office
P.O. Box 26569
Las Vegas, Nevada 89126

(702) 385-6403

NOV 23 1981

Dear Reader:

This brochure summarizes my recommendations for multiple use resource management on the public lands in Clark County into the 1990s. I'd like your thoughts on those recommendations.

This land use plan is called a "management framework plan" (MFP). It is developed in a three step process. In MFP Step 1, we developed management objectives for each resource, and then identified all feasible resource-specific recommendations that could accomplish those objectives. These recommendations usually resulted in resource-use conflicts. In MFP Step 2, where we are now, those "single-use" recommendations have been analyzed for conflicts and a set of multiple use recommendations derived from that analysis. These recommendations (summarized in this brochure) represent an integrated multiple use management plan for all resources that BLM is responsible for administering in Clark County. The plan is issue-oriented, consisting of management guidelines, rather than site-specific actions. Detailed activity plans will be prepared for resource programs on specific actions in the future, as needed.

The next step in the development of this plan is to present it to the public for your evaluation and comment. I'm initiating this public participation process by distributing this summary document. I will be available, as will Ed Ciliberti, to answer questions or to accept comments, by phone call or personal visit:

William Civish, Area Manager
300 E. Stewart St.
Downtown Post Office
Las Vegas, Nevada
385-6627

Ed Ciliberti, Chief of Planning
4765 W. Vegas Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada
385-6463

Written comments can be sent to either of us at the following address:

Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 26569
Las Vegas, Nevada 89126

The rangeland management recommendations of the MFP 2 will be analyzed as the proposed action in the forthcoming Clark County Grazing Environmental Impact Statement. Comments received on the rangeland portions of the MFP before

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

spring of 1982 can be used in the preparation of the EIS. Comments on any portions of MFP 2 will be accepted, however, until June 30, 1982.

The attached summary consists of two parts. First, the Management objectives for each resource, and second, the Multiple Use Recommendations of MFP 2. The summary, of course, is a digest of a much larger document which provides in detail the multiple-use analysis which led to these recommendations. Copies of the full document are available in the two Las Vegas BLM offices mentioned above; in the Flamingo, Charleston Heights, and Las Vegas Public Libraries; in the University of Nevada Libraries in Reno and Las Vegas, and in the BLM State Office in Reno. If you plan to use the full MFP 2 document, let me caution you to focus on the MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATION, not the MFP 1 recommendation that leads off each section. The former is my recommendation, the latter is a single-use, resource specialist recommendation from which my recommendation was devised.

Two supporting documents you might be interested in are the Clark County Planning Area Analysis (PAA) and the Clark County Unit Resource Analysis (URA). The PAA is available in the locations mentioned above. The URA is available in our two Las Vegas offices and our Reno office.

I invite and encourage your comments and suggestions. Your participation is as necessary a part of developing the Management Framework Plan for Clark County as the previous inventory and analysis steps were.

William T Civish

William T. Civish
Area Manager, Stateline-Esmeralda
Resource Area

Enclosure

1569797535

ID:88076687

HD
243
.N3
C53
1981b

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN, STEP TWO

for

PUBLIC LANDS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Administered by the

LAS VEGAS DISTRICT, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Prepared by:

William T. Civish, Area Manager
Stateline-Esmeralda Resource Area

Edward T. Ciliberti, Chief
Division of Planning & Environmental
Assistance

LANDS

Objective 1.0:
Eliminate management problems created by Federal ownership of lands needed for local urban-suburban growth. While emphasizing the Las Vegas Valley area, provide public lands for the expansion of communities and developed areas throughout Clark County. In these areas, public lands should be disposed of as rapidly as practical by sale, R&PP, exchange, or by other appropriate authority to accommodate development needs. These disposals should be accomplished with minimal management or compliance responsibility remaining with BLM. All such disposals should be accomplished in coordination with local government.

Objective 2.0:
In areas suitable for agriculture, provide public lands for agricultural use through appropriate authority. Also, provide public lands through appropriate authority in agricultural areas for residential and commercial use to avoid loss of productive farm lands.

Objective 3.0:
Provide public lands in Clark County for transportation, energy transmission, communications, and related facilities and systems through appropriate authority.

MINERALS

Objective 1.0:
Manage public lands in Clark County so as to facilitate exploration and development of leasable, locatable, and salable minerals.

FORESTRY

Objective 1.0:
Manage the existing public lands in Clark County to partially meet the demand of the Las Vegas metropolitan area for woodland and desert vegetative products on a sustained yield basis.

Objective 2.0:
Protect, preserve, and regenerate the ecological niches of Douglas Fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), Ponderosa Pine (Pinus ponderosa), Bristlecone Pine (Pinus artista), and other rare or unique plant communities.

Objective 3.0:
Use fire as a major management tool to accomplish vegetation manipulation to improve woodland quality on public lands in Clark County.

FIRE

Objective 1.0:
Prevent degradation of natural resources and destruction of structural improvements, both on public lands and on private lands adjacent to public lands, by suppressing wildfires on public lands.

Objective 2.0:
Use fire as a management tool to enhance conditions of renewable resources or meet management objectives for a site.

WATERSHED

Objective 1.0:
Provide public land resources in Clark County to aid in reducing consumption and the deterioration of quality of groundwater supplies brought on through urban usage.

Objective 2.0:
Insure that public land management actions in Clark County do not increase the potential for flood and sediment damage to private property.

Objective 3.0:
Maintain/improve the water quality of streams and springs on public lands in accordance with State and Federal regulations.

Objective 4.0:
Maintain/improve watershed conditions to reduce erosion and sedimentation and to enhance site productivity.

Objective 5.0:
Preserve and protect important paleontological sites.

RANGE MANAGEMENT

Objective 1.0:
Maintain and improve the condition of the public rangelands, through management of grazing animals, so that the rangelands become as productive as feasible for all range resources.

Objective 2.0:
Monitor use of range resources by all foraging animals to provide data needed to balance range use to range capacity. Conduct monitoring studies on rangelands requiring intensive management or where severe conflicts exist. Assure all grazing ungulates, and sensitive species such as desert tortoise, are monitored by the program. Assure related animal data (numbers, competitive uses) is gathered. Use the state-wide system as a system base.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Objective 1.0
Manage grazing of the Federal range in Clark County for a sustained yield of forage for use by domestic livestock.

Objective 2.0:
Encourage and assist the range users to develop new livestock management facilities and to improve existing management facilities as an aid to maintaining or improving range condition and trend.

WILD HORSES AND BURROS

Objective 1.0:
Manage desirable numbers of wild, free-roaming horses and burros in four areas of public lands in Clark County.

Objective 2.0:
Improve habitat for wild, free-roaming horses/burros in the designated Herd Management Areas.

WILDLIFE

Objective 1.0:
Provide and maintain sufficient quantity and quality of food, water, cover, and space to satisfy the demands of all wildlife species using habitats on public land in Clark County. Give special emphasis to Federal- and State-classified species and to BLM- identified sensitive species.

Objective 2.0:
Return native fauna to historic ranges and/or improve population numbers in current use areas through effective habitat management in cooperation with State or other Federal wildlife agencies. Increase species diversity and distribution of desired animals throughout the variety of habitat types in Clark County with special emphasis on Federal- and State-classified or BLM-identified sensitive species. Assure resource use conflicts are resolved prior to reintroduction to historic ranges or population increases.

Objective 3.0:
Provide special management consideration on public lands within Clark County to protect and increase current populations of desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizi).

RECREATION

Objective 1.0:
Manage all formally designated recreation lands and natural areas in Clark County to prevent or minimize degradation of the resource values for which the areas were set aside. Designate any additional areas found to be worthy through study or inventory, by the Bureau of Land Management or cooperating agencies. Provide compatible recreation opportunities where desirable or feasible, and enhance management of the areas through public education and interpretation to improve recreation opportunities.

Objective 2.0:
Manage public lands in Clark County to maximize outdoor recreation opportunities. Ensure that management actions are not allowed that degrade, preclude use of, or deny access to principal recreation areas.

Objective 3.0:
Cooperate with and support other agencies' efforts to provide increased outdoor recreation opportunities, and/or access to existing recreation areas, on their lands and on adjacent public lands, for urban residents and visitors alike.

Objective 4.0:
Provide visitor safety and resource protection on all public lands in the county. Cooperate with local agencies for those services which BLM is not able to provide.

Objective 5.0:
Manage the public lands in the Spring Mountain Range primarily for the recreational values there. All other resource plans and programs will be coordinated with and subordinated to the recreation program. Cooperate with private landholders and other agencies as needed.

Objective 6.0:
Manage recreational off-road vehicle (ORV) use on public lands in Clark County by providing a spectrum of opportunities ranging from individual, casual travel to highly organized competitive events.

Objective 7.0:
Protect Wilderness Study Areas within Clark County to maintain potential suitability for inclusion into the National Wilderness Preservation System, until such time that Congress designates them as wilderness or releases them from further wilderness consideration.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Objective 1.0:
Significant cultural resource properties on public lands in Clark County will be subject to one or more protection and/or stabilization measures. An adjunct of protection is the limitation of off-road vehicle (ORV) activity in certain sensitive areas.

MULTIPLE USE RECOMMENDATIONS

1 - Dispose of all public lands within the Las Vegas Valley with priority to the Santini-Burton Act area, identified on the Las Vegas Valley Sub-Unit MFP 1 Disposal Opportunities Overlay. To provide maximum management flexibility, all disposal will be by the most appropriate authority available. Parcels needed for sand and gravel pits or adjacent to sand and gravel pits will be disposed of on a lowest priority basis, with parcels in high density developed areas disposed of first. Consider Clark County to have met the requirements for ability to maintain or restore beneficial floodplain values. All disposals will be in coordination with local government officials and agencies. (L 1.1, WS 2.1, WS 2.2)

2 - Dispose of all public parcels within the settled limits of the following communities: 1) Indian Springs; 2) Goodsprings; 3) Searchlight; 4) Nelson. Disposal of these parcels should be on an as-needed basis, and should be accomplished by the most appropriate disposal authority. All disposals should be in coordination with local government, with the goal of complete disposal in the communities completed by 1990, unless sound management or statutory constraints preclude meeting this deadline. (L 1.2)

3 - Through appropriate authority, transfer out of Federal ownership all isolated parcels of 160 or less coterminous acres in 1) Eastern Pahrump Valley; 2) Mountain Springs Community; 3) Sandy (Mesquite Valley) Community; 4) Jean; 5) Sloan and "Sloan Turn-Off" areas; 6) Blue Diamond; 7) Moapa Valley Area; 8) Virgin Valley Area; 9) Kyle Canyon Road Small Tract Area; 10) Laughlin. Total blocking of public and private lands by the year 2000 should be a reasonable goal, but not a mandatory deadline. (L 1.3)

4 - Grant leases to accommodate private and commercial uses on a case-by-case, as-needed basis, in keeping with BLM policy. Be guided in leasing by the following recommendations: 1) The parcel is adjacent to or in proximity to private lands, unless an overriding need is documented. 2) Local government approves of the lease. 3) No BLM resource management program would be adversely affected. 4) Leasing is preferable to sale because of the anticipation that the land will appropriately be returned to the pool of open public lands at a later date. 5) Disposal by sale is not appropriate.
(L 1.4, FOR 1.2, WS 1.2, WS 4.7)

5 - By appropriate authority, lease or dispose of lands determined suitable for agricultural production or experimentation, where significant impacts to other resources would not result. Leases or disposals in excess of 320 acres per individual require justification of the increased acreage. Lease or dispose of no lands in the Muddy or Virgin River floodplains until completion of an adequate HMP, scheduled for 1984. (L 2.1)

6 - Provide public lands to accommodate commercial, industrial, and residential uses in the following agricultural communities. 1) Pahrump Valley (Eastern); 2) Sandy (Mesquite) Valley; 3) Virgin River Valley; 4) Moapa - Logandale area. Each lease/disposal opportunity will be examined individually to assure that the most advantageous use of the land takes place. (L 2.2)

7 - Do not establish utility system corridors until the completion of the Nevada Transportation and Utility Corridor Study (under preparation by the BLM Nevada State Ofice). In the interim, grant system rights-of-way on an individual basis. (L 3.1)

8 - Promote expansion and multi-user growth of existing communication sites where technical considerations allow. Designate and grant applications for use of new sites only upon justification that existing sites are unfeasible technically or economically. New sites should, of course, be developed as required and authorized pursuant to appropriate authority. Unless road access exists to a proposed new site, access will be by helicopter only. (L 3.2)

9 - Where appropriate, grant airport lease applications for airport facilities within Clark County to increase the access by and qualities of air services in rural Clark County and to augment existing airport facilities. Solicit public input and coordinate with local officials to meet the goals of: 1) Establish new or expanded airport facilities where such would be in the public's interest. 2) Avoid proliferation of airport leases within limited geographic areas or where such facilities would have no real value to the public, but would in fact serve only a private individual or firm. (L 3.3)

10 - Manage all of the Federally owned mineral estate in Clark County as open to mineral entry and to mineral licensing under the following guidelines:

A. Identify in all issued mineral leases, that impacts to crucial bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitat will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage.
B. Whenever possible, avoid surface disturbing activities under mineral entry 3809 plans of operations in bighorn sheep crucial summer habitat.
C. All roads created by mineral activities will be referred to the Area Manager for disposition prior to the end of the mineral activity.
D. Identify in all mineral leases issued in the floodplain of the Virgin River, that impacts to critical habitat of threatened or endangered species will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage as identified through "Section 7"- consultation.
E. Identify in all mineral leases issued for those washes identified on the Nongame Bird URA III Overlay, that impacts to those washes will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage.
F. Whenever possible, avoid surface occupancy on or within 1/4 mile of developed or designated recreational facilities.

G. Identify in all issued mineral leases, that operations planned for areas with "severe" or "critical" soil surface factors (SSF) and in areas with "moderate" and "slight" SSF and "high" erosion hazards, will be subject to special mitigative measures to offset impacts identified at the plan of operations stage.
H. Whenever possible, avoid surface occupancy on riparian zones.
I. Within crucial desert tortoise habitat, require mineral operators to identify and avoid, whenever possible, actual tortoise use areas (i.e., denning sites) prior to initiation of operations.
J. Within crucial desert tortoise habitat, require mineral operators to engage qualified wildlife biologists to search for and remove desert tortoises from operations sites prior to initiation of operations.
K. Avoid surface occupancy on relic stands of Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, bristlecone pine, and other relic plant communities.
L. In cooperation with Nevada Division of State Parks, make mineral leasing decisions for Valley of Fire State Park by mapping resource occurrence, as in the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands Oil and Gas Environmental Assessment, and using that document's impact matrix to develop lease stipulations. (M 1.1, WL 1.2, WL 1.10, WL 1.39, WL 3.1, WL 3.2)

11 - Maintain four sand and gravel pits in the Las Vegas Valley for mineral material sales to the public, one in each quadrant of the Valley. Complete establishment by FY84. Evaluate every two years to determine if residential development encroachment warrants relocation. Exclude all sites within the boundaries established by Public Law 96-586. (M 1.3)

12 - By FY84, identify potential sand and gravel pits near each rural community in Clark County which does not currently have one. (M 1.4)

13 - Develop a greenwood cutting program in pinyon and juniper areas in the Spring, Virgin, and McCullough Mountain Ranges, with priority for the Spring Mountains. Cutting areas should be identified through activity planning and serve multiple use purposes. Wood cuts should be supervised by Bureau personnel and be accomplished during the summer months when temporary help is most available. All cutting plans on the Spring Mountain Range must be coordinated with, and subordinated to, recreation plans for that area. Reseeding of a cut area will take place the autumn following the cut. (FOR 1.1, LG 2.5, WL 1.31).

14 - Prior to initiation of rights-of-way development, mining actions, or other activities which would destroy desert or woodland vegetation, take place, the area should be opened to the public to remove vegetation that would otherwise be destroyed.

Coordinate the removal of native desert vegetation (yuccas and cacti) with the Nevada Division of Forestry. Develop an advertising program whereby the developer or the Bureau has the responsibility for making the public aware of upcoming sales or give-aways. (FOR 1.3, WS 1.1)

15 - Nominate the following areas for the ACEC identification and designation process. Undertake the process with priority to relic stands of trees. (FOR 2.1, WL 1.37, CR 1.6)

Area	Reason for Identification As An ACEC
To include stands of Douglas Fir, Ponderosa Pine, Bristlecone Pine, and other unique plant communities	Rarity of occurrence. Stands of unique timber species exist in the higher altitudes of the Virgin, Spring, and lesser mtn. ranges. Unique cacti communities exist in various areas throughout Clark County - (URA 3, 4)
High probability areas for archeological finds (see MFP 3 overlay for locations).	High potential for fragile archeological resources.
Old Spanish Trail	Historical values and preservation.

16 - Determine the need for interpretive signing programs during ACEC consideration. (FOR 2.2)

17 - Enter into a contractual agreement with the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) to obtain nursery stock to be used in the rehabilitation of areas which are destroyed or altered by fire.

18 - Develop by FY85 a programmatic plan for fire rehabilitation on public lands throughout Clark County with priority for the Spring Mountain Range and the South McCullough Range. Conclude a contractual agreement with NDF for nursery stock for revegetation by FY85 to coincide with completion of the programmatic rehabilitation plan. (FOR 3.4, FOR 3.5, F 1.10, WS 4.1, WS 4.3)

19 - Develop an effective fire prevention and presuppression program. Place prevention signs on all major access roads.

Consider the following elements:
A.) Develop a fire prevention sign plan which would include a catalog of all available fire prevention signs and sites where these signs are to be placed within Clark County.

B.) Develop fire prevention display for the Red Rock Visitor Center. Work cooperatively with the Red Rock Visitor Center interpretive staff, to develop a display and a slide-tape presentation concerning fire prevention.

C.) Establish a fire prevention contact reference guide involving newspapers, radio stations, television stations, exhibitions, fairs, and other media outlets, for the purposes of promoting fire prevention and the fire program.
(F 1.1)

20 - Develop a comprehensive fire pre-attack plan by FY83 for Clark County, incorporating information as described in the Clark County URA -Fire Management .37. (F 1.2, WS 4.2)

21 - Develop a Fire Detection Plan for Clark County by FY83 that includes aerial reconnaissance flight patterns, a directory of cooperative fire detection agencies, a directory of available reconnaissance aircraft, and a procedural guide to the implementation of the detection forces.
(F 1.3)

22 - Develop, by FY85, a fire management plan to combat wildland fires on public lands in Clark County. Suppression priorities are as follows: 1.) Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands; 2.) Mountain Springs/Mt. Potosi Area; 3.) Kyle Canyon; 4.) Lee Canyon; 5.) Remaining Spring Mountain Range with priority to recreation areas; 6.) Other areas of urban-wildland interface; 7.) Virgin Mountains - relic stands of trees; 8.) South McCullough Mountains-unique vegetation areas.

Provide fire protection to the following historical properties, either in conjunction with areas listed above, if they are located there, or otherwise as priority 9:, Mt. Potosi Cabin, Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns, Searchlight Mining District, Virgin Mtn. Cabin, Goodsprings Mining District, Mt. Potosi Mines, Trout Canyon Cabin, South McCullough Wickiup, Crescent Peak Mining District.

Use of fire suppression equipment and techniques to their maximum design capabilities will be modified as necessary to assure no greater damage occurs to resource values from the suppression effort than could occur from the fire. On all fires in the priority areas, a resource advisor will be requested and assigned. (F 1.4, F 1.6, FOR 2.3, R 4.5, CR 1.7)

23 - Improve legal access into areas of high fire occurrence and/or high resource values. Arrange for easements where needed or access across private property. Maintain key BLM roads by annual grading in the following priority:
A.) Wheeler Pass Road; B.) Lovell Canyon Road; C.) Highway 88 (Old Pahrump Highway); D.) Red Rock Summit Road (Willow Springs to Lovell Canyon Road) (F 1.5)

24 - Update all fire-related cooperative agreements on an annual basis. (F 1.7)

25 - Work closely with the Clark County Coordinator of the office of Volunteer Fire Departments, to achieve cooperation in training, prevention, detection, initial attack, use of facilities, and exchange of fire equipment. (F 1.8)

26 - Develop and implement by FY83 an aggressive District program for investigating fire trespasses. (F 1.9)

27 - Develop a county-wide program to utilize prescribed burning and modified suppression of wildfires as a vegetation manipulation tool. Vegetation manipulation areas must be identified through activity plans (AMP, HMP, HMAP, etc.) and must serve multiple-use objectives. The first manipulation area should be identified in FY83, for implementation during FY85, so as to allow two years for the sale of firewood and other products on the burn site. Greenwood cutting should precede all prescribed burns. After FY85, target should be a minimum of one prescribed burn per year. Prescription for a burn/modified suppression site should be developed within one year after site identification. Sites with relatively rare tree species, (e.g., ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, bristlecone pine, etc.), may be selected for prescribed burning to remove undergrowth and aid regeneration, but extreme care must be taken to avoid damage or destruction of the key tree species. Complete such prescribed burn plans by FY87. Modified suppression plans should be closely coordinated county-wide with adjacent landowners and firefighting agencies. No modified suppression of wildland fires will be used in the Spring Mountain Range. Prescribed burning in the Spring Mountain Range must be closely coordinated with, and subordinated to, recreation plans. Develop, and implement during FY84, a public education program explaining the purposes, ecological benefits, and economics of fire as a resource management tool. (F 2.1, FOR 2.4, FOR 3.1, FOR 3.2, FOR 3.3, LG 1.10, WHB 2.1, WL 1.30)

28 - Develop a prescribed fire workshop program to include the most recent concepts and developments in the area of fire management and prescribed fire techniques, for all District personnel. This program should precede development of proposed prescribed burn areas. (F 2.2)

29 - Develop a desert vegetation sale/permit system to salvage vegetation in areas to be disturbed, such as roadways, pipelines, proposed burn areas, etc., to provide vegetation for water conservation landscaping. (WS 1.1)

30 - Assess all Bureau-initiated and Bureau-authorized activities for nonpoint-source pollution potential. Minimize all such potential for pollution following Best Management Practices (BMPs) as identified by the State of Nevada. Monitor potentially impacted streams to determine the effects of such activities. (WS 3.4)

31 - Encourage recreational ORV use in designated areas, such as the Las Vegas Dunes Play Area, to offset ORV degradation of soils in more critical areas. (WS 4.4)

32 - Adopt protective actions to maintain or enhance watershed conditions. Such actions should include those on Table 1. (WS 4.5)

33 - Develop and implement an evaluation and maintenance plan for watershed control structures within Clark County. (WS 4.8)

34 - Determine proper stocking rates of domestic livestock on ephemeral-perennial range, desirable numbers of wild horses and burros in herd management areas, and populations of mule deer, bighorn sheep, and elk county-wide through a rangeland monitoring program covering all grazing animals, and the CRMP process. It will be the Bureau's goal to attain the reasonable numbers provided by the Nevada Department of Wildlife. Starting point in FY83 will be existing numbers of wildlife and wild horses and burros, and initial stocking rates of livestock set through CRMP, or through agreement with the allotment operator. (RM 1.1, RM 1.5, RM 1.6, RM 1.7, RM 1.8, LG 1.1)

34 - a. Manage the following allotments for ephemeral-perennial livestock grazing:

*Azure Ridge
Billy Goat Peak
Bunkerville
Crescent Peak
Gold Butte
Hen Springs
Hidden Valley
Ireteba Peaks
Jean Lake
Lucky Strike
McCullough Mountain
*Mesquite Community
Muddy Mountains
Roach Lake
Table Mountain
Upper Mormon Mesa
Wheeler Wash

(*Administered by Arizona Strip District.)

Until such time as AMPs or grazing systems are established through CRMP, continue to license grazing on the foregoing allotments under the ephemeral range rule.

b. Continue to manage the following allotments for livestock grazing under the ephemeral range rule:

Acton-Farrier
Arrow Canyon
Black Butte
Christmas Tree Pass
Dry Lake
Flat Top Mesa
Jackrabbit
Lime Springs
Lower Mormon Mesa
Mesa Cliff
Pulsipher Wash
South Point
Stump Springs
Toquop Sheep
Ute
White Basin
Younts Spring

c. License no livestock grazing in the following allotments, reserving them for wildlife, wild horse and burro, and other resource uses:

Glendale
Kyle Canyon
Muddy River
Newberry Mountains
Overton Arm
Pittman Well
Roses Spring
Rox
Spring Mountains
Sunrise Mountain
Wheeler Slope
5555 (Indian Springs)
6666 (River Mountains)
7777 (Las Vegas Valley)
9999 (Lake Mead NRA below Gold Butte)

d. Ten of the 15 ephemeral-perennial allotments administered by the Las Vegas District should receive intensive management attention with the major share of the material, monetary, and personnel resources allocated to the planning unit dedicated to the monitoring, CRMP, and activity planning and implementation of grazing management on these allotments. These allotments are:

Bunkerville
Crescent Peak
Gold Butte
Hidden Valley
Ireteba Peaks
Jean Lake
Lucky Strike
McCullough Mountain
Roach Lake
Wheeler Wash

The ephemeral allotments, along with Billy Goat Peak, Hen Springs, Table Mountain, and Muddy Mountains should receive custodial management attention, with the expenditure of only so much personnel effort and funds as to assure no degradation of resources.

e. As long as the current operation on Upper Mormon Mesa continues, that allotment should receive only maintenance management attention.

f. Management intensity on the Azure Ridge and Mesquite Community allotments will be determined by the Arizona Strip District.

(RM 1.2, RM 1.3, RM 1.4, L 1.5, LG 1.2, LG 1.7, LG 1.8, WL 1.16, WL 1.17, WL 1.18, WL 1.22, WL 1.25, R 1.11)

35 - In areas of crucial bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitat, develop, through the CRMP process, an amount of ephemeral forage to be reserved, prior to livestock turnout, to serve the needs of that wildlife population. Conduct necessary field examinations prior to licensing livestock use. (RM 1.9, WL 1.15, 1.16, 3.5)

36 - Accomplish bighorn sheep introductions (and permit natural expansion) into historic habitats, only after habitat management plans have been developed identifying and mitigating potential conflicts. Insure adequate public participation, including CRMP if appropriate, is conducted in developing the HMP. Provide forage for reasonable numbers of bighorn sheep identified in the HMP. (RM 1.10, RM 1.11, WL 1.21, WL 1.38)

37 - Develop and implement the activity plans identified for the county. If at all possible, combine efforts into a single coordinated plan. Failing that, insure separate plans on the same area are totally coordinated. In the Spring Mountain Range above the 5,000 foot elevational contour, all activity plans will be coordinated with and subordinated to recreation plans. AMPs will be developed for the following allotments: Wheeler Wash, Gold Butte, Bunkerville, McCullough Mountain, Hidden Valley, Ireteba Peaks, and Jean Lake. Table 2 suggests a planning sequence which may be used if funding and other constraints permit. (LG 1.4, WS 4.6, WL 2.1, WL 2.2, WL 2.3, WL 2.6, WL 2.7, WL 3.7, CR 1.1, CR 1.9)

38 - Through the CRMP process, review the Crescent Peak AMP and evaluate its success in meeting its range management objectives. Revise the plan as necessary. Complete the review and adjustment during FY84. (LG 1.5, WL 1.26)

39 - Develop a maintenance schedule that will bring all range improvements to good operating condition and on regular maintenance shedules by 1990. Include those existing improvements identified in Wildlife recommendations 1.24 and 1.33 that need to be corrected. (See Table 3) Where maintenance is not accomplished, curtail or eliminate the benefit accruing from the improvement.

Future improvements will be coordinated with other resource interests (including Nevada Department of Wildlife) to alleviate potential conflicts.

Future water developments should be designed to include escape devices and other facilities (drinkers) which will be constructed concurrently.

Future fences will be built to applicable wildlife specifications in BLM Manual 1737. (LG 2.1, WL 1.24, WL 1.33, WL 1.36)

40 - Encourage and assist range users in constructing fences and other projects where needed to improve management. See Table 4. Insure the preservation of normal wild horse distribution and movement patterns. Construct all fences to meet wildlife standards. (LG 2.4)

41 - Manage wild horses and burros in four herd management areas in Clark County: Gold Butte, Muddy Mountains, Spring Mountain Range, Eldorado Mountains. Do not eliminate wild horses and burros from any Herd Management Areas unless justified through monitoring and coordinated through the CRMP process. Develop Herd Management Area Plans (HMAP) in the following priority: Gold Butte (FY83), Spring Mountains (FY85), Muddy Mountains (FY87), and Eldorado Mountains (FY89). Insure such activity plans are developed concurrently with other resource activity plans. In particular assure that the Gold Butte HMAP is fully integrated and coordinated with the Virgin Mountain HMP during FY83. (WHB 1.1, WHB 1.3, LG 1.9, WL 1.29)

42 - Allow mechanical treatments for vegetation manipulation throughout Clark County. Determine areas to be treated through activity plans (HMP, AMP, etc.), and assure that the treatment serves multiple use purposes. Do not use chemical treatments in Clark County. Consider use of watershed tillage and water control facilities in activity planning for watershed improvements.

Any treatments in the Spring Mountain Range must be coordinated with and subordinated to the recreation program there. (WHB 2.2)

43 - Cooperate with National Park Service to fence the airstrip at Echo Bay. (WHB 2.5)

44 - During development of all activity plans special attention will be given to protecting riparian zones as wildlife habitat and to protecting associated native flora. Develop limitations for surface disturbing activities on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the impacts. (WL 1.1, WS 3.3)

45 - Encourage all users of public lands to travel existing roads or trails in crucial wildlife habitats described in Wildlife recommendations 1.4, 1.5, and 3.3. Where possible, new road or trail construction should be avoided in the described crucial wildlife habitat. Coordination with mineral or geophysical companies that plan road construction within the crucial habitat should be accomplished to mitigate the adverse impacts that would occur as a result of such construction. Where new roads or trails are constructed to support a temporary activity, the builder will refer the road to BLM for disposition prior to project's end. (WL 1.4, WL 1.5, WL 3.3)

46 - Do not license grazing by domestic sheep in the McCullough Allotment. Allow cattle grazing. (WL 1.19)

47 - Resolve the domestic - bighorn sheep conflicts in the Bunkerville and Billy Goat Peak allotments through the CRMP process before the end of FY83. Do not license domestic sheep grazing until the resolution is accomplished. Continue the current trailing operation during the CRMP process. Do not develop new dual-use allotments in current or historic bighorn sheep habitat (or introduce bighorn sheep into current or historic domestic sheep allotments) until potential conflicts are identified and resolved through an HMP or AMP. (WL 1.20)

48 - All new fencing projects will be constructed according to applicable wildlife specifications in BLM Manual 1737. The fences listed below should receive first priority for adjustment by FY88. Other fences may be identified through HMP development. 1.) Key West Seasonal Use Fence; 2.) Virgin Mountain Seep Spring Fence; 3.) Gold Butte Allotment Fence; 4.) Perkins Spring Fence (Sec. 1, T.19S., R.69E.); 5.) Scott's Well Fence (Sec. 7, T.28S., R.61E.); 6.) Mud Spring Fence (Sec.14, T.18S., R.56E.)

All proposed fence construction will be coordinated with the Nevada Department of Wildlife. (WL 1.24)

49 - Remove wild/abandoned livestock from public land. (WL 1.27)

50 - No new water facilities or extensions of existing facilities should be constructed for livestock, wild horses, or burros without development and appropriate review of an environmental assessment to assure no new conflicts are created between livestock and bighorn sheep. (WL 1.28)

51 - Provide water for wildlife, wild horses and burros, and livestock use on public land throughout Clark County. Existing waters should be maintained at the source and actions taken (such as fencing) by 1990 to exclude livestock and wild horses and burros from degrading the source or associated riparian areas (see Tables WL 3 and 4). Where livestock or wild horses and burros now use the waters, use must be provided away from the protected areas. Existing forage use by any animal should not be denied by denying water access until habitat/allotment use levels are determined after CRMP and monitoring.
New waters can be developed (by BLM, NDOW, or ranchers), but such developments must not create new competition for forage or habitat among wildlife, livestock, or wild horses and burros. Wildlife drinkers should be routinely provided on all projects, unless new conflicts are created thereby. Do not develop new waters which have the sole purpose of expanding wild horse and burro areas or periods-of-use.

On all new water developments permitted by BLM, and on all waters in which BLM has an interest, wildlife use should be made available to wildlife on a year-round basis. (WL 1.35, WL 1.23, WL 1.32, WL 1.34, LG 2.2, WHB 1.4, WHB 2.4, WS 3.1)

52 - Protect and manage the Pine Creek Research Natural Area and the Desert View Natural Environmental Area for their scenic, scientific, botanical, geologic, and educational values. Develop an information base on the Natural Areas for use in interpretive efforts and to gain a better understanding of the ecology of the areas. Develop and implement a Recreation Resource Monitoring System to provide protection through use supervision and to monitor the condition of the recreation-related natural resources present. (R 1.1)

53 - Remove the "outstanding natural area" designation for Sunrise Mountain and have these lands fall into the multiple-use management category with an emphasis on recreation use. Recognizing existing and future intensive recreation use, prepare, by 1985, a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) for the area, adjusting the boundary for the RAMP as research/needs dictate. The RAMP will be considered and coordinated with other resource activity plans on the area. (R 1.2)

54 - Protect and manage the Virgin Mountain Natural Area as per guidelines contained in the CFR and manage Whitney Pockets for its recreation and archaeological use and potential. In essence, manage both units as a single unit, but the contiguous area between the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets is not included as part of the management unit. Develop an information base on the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets, and develop and implement a resource monitoring and visitor service system. If use warrants, prepare an RAMP on the area between FY87 and FY92. Coordinate the RAMP with other activity plans. (R 1.3)

55 - Develop and implement a Recreation Resource Monitoring System to provide protection through use supervision and to monitor the condition of the recreation-related natural resources present on the following areas. Evaluate their suitability for designation as natural environmental areas (botanical sightseeing) and complete designation, if warranted, by 1985. Develop an environmental assessment (EA) as the principal analysis tool.

a. Piute Valley--Joshua Tree Forest Proposed Natural Area;
b. Cottonwood Cholla Proposed Natural Area
c. Potosi Barrel Cactus Proposed Natural Area
d. Paradise Valley Proposed Natural Area

Add appropriate protective stipulations to permits issued for the area to assure that the vegetation and the visual environment is not degraded. (R 1.4)

56 - Manage the 4,930-acre Virgin River Recreation Lands for their open-space, wildlife, and river-access values as they relate to recreation. Develop an information base for use in interpretive efforts and to gain a better understanding of the ecology and potential uses of the area. A reevaluation of the use should be considered during mid-life of this MFP (1985-86). If a significant increase in visitor use or demand has occurred, an RAMP should be developed for the area. (R 1.5)

57 - Manage the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands as set forth in the 1975 Environmental Impact Statement and the 1977 Master Plan. This plan serves in lieu of a BLM-prepared RAMP. Several major programs are focused on responding to the interests of the public, as well as to provide proper management of the 62,000-acre area. Phase in proposed sections of the Master Plan and the Visitors Services Plan as funding, staffing, and public demand warrant. Treat the Master Plan as an ever-changing dynamic tool.

See Table 5 delineating the proposed activities and planned accomplishments for the RRCRL during the next five years. (R 1.6, R 1.7)

58 - Initiate a study program to determine if any resource values in the contiguous to the National Scenic Area identified by the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA), BLM, Riverside District on the California side of the state line, need special management consideration or protection. Until the study shows otherwise, follow current management practices. (R 1.9)

59 - Oppose the designation of the the McCullough Mountains and the Frenchman Mountain-Rainbow Gardens area by the National Park Service, (Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service) as National Natural Landmarks. (R 1.10)

60 - Enhance prime horseback riding areas in Clark County through a combination of facility development and reduction of conflicts with other users. Cooperate with other agencies to maximize available resources.

(a) In Red Rock Canyon: implement the equestrian trail system identified in the master plan. Begin construction of the portion along the base of the escarpment in FY83. Coordinate efforts with the Nevada Division of State Parks.

(b) Cooperate with Clark County in developing a trail system for the Las Vegas Wash/Rainbow Gardens/Sunrise Mountain Area. Eliminate ORV use from designated equestrian trails. Sign and mark hazardous road crossings to protect equestrians. Schedule development according to the county's plan for developing the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park.

(c) Develop an equestrian trail plan in the Floyd R. Lamb State Park area with, and at the request of, the Nevada Division of State Parks. (R 2.1, R 2.2)

61 - Enhance hiking opportunities in prime Clark County areas through a combination of facility development and reduction of conflicts with other users. Cooperate with other agencies to maximize available resources.

(a) In Red Rock Canyon, implement the hiking trail system identified in the master plan. Begin construction of the segments at the base of the escarpment in FY83. Coordinate efforts with the Nevada Division of State Parks.

(b) Cooperate with the U.S. Forest Service in developing trails in the Spring Mountains which tie into Toiyabe National Forest trails. Priority segments are the Red Rock to Charleston Peak trail (which would be designed and implemented as part of the Red Rock trail system) and the Mt. Stirling to Cold Creek/Willow Creek to Camp Bonanza Trail. Design of this portion should be in FY83. (R 2.2)

62 - Manage the following areas for high value geological sightseeing opportunities. Utilize the expertise at UNLV in interpreting the geological significance of the areas.

(a) Gold Butte - allow individual ORV use throughout in conjunction with sightseeing. Develop interpretive signing by the mid-1980s.

(b) Sunrise and Frenchman Mountains/Rainbow Gardens - enhance sightseeing and related activities through the preparation of an RAMP (see Recreation 1.2).

(c) Gregory's Arch/Keyhole Canyon/Knob Hill - install interpretive signs, access trails, and semi-primitive day-use facilities, and prepare a brochure. Accomplish tasks incrementally through the 1980s.

(d) Muddy Mountains - insure access on the series of unimproved vehicular routes in the area. (R 2.3, R 2.4, R 2.5, R 2.6)

63 - Manage a variety of areas in Clark County for their value as wildlife observation areas for species of interest in the Mohave Desert. Assure that access is retained over BLM or county roads, and that new roads are not created unless absolutely necessary. See Table 6. (R 2.4)

64 - Manage key areas in Clark County for their botanical sightseeing values. Insure that existing public roads are kept open and that entry to any of these areas is not restricted.

(a) Southern Potosi and Bird Springs Range - Contains very good stands of barrel cactus, prickly pear cactus, century plant, and other species representative of the Mohave Desert.

(b) McCullough Mountains South, including the flanks - contains high botanical values which include virgin stands of Mohave Desert vegetation.

(c) Newberry Mountains - Above the 3,500 foot elevation, manage to preserve botanical values. Coordinate with the National Park Service for visitor services and patrol in this moderately utilized area. (R 2.5)

65 - Manage significant rock and mineral collecting areas so as not to exclude access for this purpose. Make sure existing public roads are kept open, and that entry to these areas is not restricted. Areas identified for such collecting are listed in Table 7. (R 2.6)

66 - Manage the following five sites for hang gliding. Ensure public access to these is kept open.

(a) Mt. Potosi
(b) Little Potosi
(c) Table Mountain
(d) Sloan
(e) Jean - determine the specific facility and development needs of this area as part of the Jean/Roach RAMP. (R 2.7)

67 - Manage the public lands and support the Nevada Department of Wildlife in an effort to upgrade hunting opportunities in Clark County. Ensure public access is maintained to the hunting areas identified in Table 8 and to any new areas developed for hunting.

Competitive ORV events will be managed on a case-by-case basis taking into account the hunting opportunity available in the area during the specific hunting season. (R 2.8)

68 - Manage the Eldorado Valley for multiple recreation values. Re-evaluate in FY86 to determine if increased usage warrants development of an RAMP. (R 2.9, R 2.10)

69 - Manage the Jean Valley/Ivanpah Valley area for multiple recreation values. Re-evaluate in FY86 to determine if increased usage warrants development of an RAMP. (R 2.10)

70 - Develop by FY84 a cooperative agreement with the Nevada Division of State Parks (NDSP) which would identify: 1.) Long range cooperation; and 2.) Recreation goals and objectives between the two agencies. (R 3.1)

71 - Develop a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Clark County, to develop projects such as the bicycle trail through RRCRL along county and BLM rights-of-way by 1986. Other potential areas for cooperation include equestrian trail corridors or day-use facilities around outlying towns. (R 3.2)

72 - Educate the public to hazards such as flash floods, wildfire, desert survival, and open mineshafts, which are associated with the county's public lands. Brochures, safety messages in interpretive programs, TV spots, public service announcements, and news releases should be utilized. In some cases physical barriers should be provided. (R 4.1)

73 - Identify, map, and mitigate, as funds are available, all potential hazards to ORV recreational users. (R 4.2)

74 - Provide law enforcement in high use recreation areas, particularly the RRCRL, through whatever means are available to the BLM. Consider cooperative agreements with qualified agencies, such as Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department or Nevada Division of State Parks. If law enforcement authority is given to BLM, agency personnel should immediately be trained.

Priority areas for law enforcement needs are:

a.) RRCRL
b.) Red Springs
c.) Cold Creek/Willow Creek
d.) All other areas

Develop and pursue a contract and/or cooperative agreement with the following agencies to enforce State and local laws:

a.) Metropolitan Police (Sheriff)
b.) Nevada Division of State Parks
c.) Nevada Division of Forestry
d.) Nevada Division of Wildlife
(R 4.3)

75 - Coordinate with the Sheriff's Jeep Posse and Metro Special Operations Unit to provide search and rescue operations for climbers, hikers, and other recreationists on public lands. BLM personnel should also receive training and be able to handle many situations. (R 4.4)

76 - Prepare a series of RAMPs on critical use areas for gradual development of the Spring Mountains to serve as a major recreation area for Southern Nevada. Within 10 years develop an overall master plan for recreational uses on the mountain range. The goal should be to maximize the recreation experience for the number of visitors the resource can tolerate. Type of use would vary from location to location but should include the following: overnight camping, picnicking, day-use activities such as historical sightseeing, certain kinds of ORV use, hiking, and other compatible activities as deemed appropriate. Current uses, such as mining, grazing, and forest products harvesting would not be restricted, but recreation would become the major use in these mountains. Overall, developments would be at a relatively low level. Since trailers and RVs are extremely popular, some provisions for them should be made. For the most part, roads should remain unpaved, campgrounds small, and facilities simple. Users should be expected to carry out their own trash, especially from remote areas.

Coordination with the Toiyabe National Forest, Mt. Charleston District, and public participation should be included in this planning project.

All resource activity planning in the Spring Mountain Range above the 5,000 foot contour is to be coordinated with and subordinated to recreational plans. See Tables 2 and 9. (R5.1)

77 - Develop and institute a monitoring program for the entire county which would catalog the specific effects of different ORV uses on resources present. Implement the program during FY84. (R 6.1, R 6.2, R 6.3)

78 - Within 3 years, define and determine suitable areas for the following:

a. Motorcycle Trail Systems Park(s): these would be designed for individual, family, and small group use, providing both point-to-point and closed loop sightseeing trails with day use and overnight camping opportunities.

b. ORV Play Area(s): This would be designed for individual, family, and group use, providing day-use areas and overnight camping facilities.

c. Motocross Park(s): This would have one or more closed-loop course areas and provide for adequate spectator areas. (R 6.2)

79 - Provide for a portion of a cross-state trail for ORVs from the Las Vegas Dunes area through Meadow Valley Wash, then north to the Pony Express Trail. (R 6.3)

80 - Manage Clark County within the guidelines of the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review so that wilderness characteristics of these lands remain until such time as the areas are included into the National Wilderness Preservation System or are released from further consideration by Congress. (R 7.1)

81 - Complete the study phase of all Wilderness Study Areas and make recommendations to the Secretary on all suitable and nonsuitable study areas found within Clark County by December 31, 1985. (R 7.2)

82 - Nominate the Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns to the National Register of Historic Places during FY83. (CR 1.3)

83 - Request Interagency Archaeological Services to evaluate the Old Spanish Trail, Mohave Trail, and the Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns as possible National Historic Landmarks. (CR 1.4)

84 - Develop tests for and install interpretive signs for the Willow Springs Archaeological loop trail. In addition, develop an interpretive trail-head brochure keyed to the various interpretive stations placed at strategic points along the trail. (CR 1.4)

85 - Preserve a representative sample of line shacks, mining cabins, and other isolated historical structures. Document and preserve isolated graves on public land. (CR 1.5)

86 - Initiate regular and systematic patrols of specific areas and/or sites containing high cultural resource values. Site types to be patrolled on a priority basis include rock art sites, shelter cave sites, and historic sites with architectural features, as identified on the URA Step 3 Cultural Resources Sites Overlay and in the BLM Archeological Site records. Patrolling for cultural resource protection is to be accomplished in conjunction with other resource field work by DAT-trained personnel. (CR 1.8)

87 - Determine sources of deterioration and priorities for preservation through field evaluations of all cultural resource sites. (CR 1.10)

TABLE 1

SSF Class	Erosion Hazard	Protective Action Grazing	Protective Action Construction
Severe	High	1	2
Severe	Medium	1	2
Severe	Low	1	2
Critical	High	1	2
Critical	Medium	1	2
Critical	Low	1	2
Moderate	High		2
Moderate	Medium		
Moderate	Low		
Slight	High		2
Slight	Medium		
Slight	Low		
Stable	High		2
Stable	Medium		
Stable	Low		

Protective Actions:

1. Change management of grazing animals in such a way that vegetation and plant litter ground cover is incrementally increased by 25% and the erosion condition is reduced to the moderate SSF class.
2. Minimize construction-related activities in these areas.

TABLE 2

	AMP	HMP-DT	HMP-BHS	HMP-ELK	HMP-OTHER	RAMP	HMAP	Watershed	CRMP
FY 83	Wheeler Wash Gold Butte Bunkerville	Horse springs Wash Virgin Mtn.	Gold Butte Virgin Mtn.	Cold Creek/ Wheeler Wash	Cold Creek/ Willow Creek	Cold Creek/ Wheeler Wash Virgin Mtn.	Gold Butte		Willow Sp.
FY 84	McCullough Mtn. Crescent Peak Hidden Valley	Riverside Piute Valley	McCullough Mtn Highland Range	Trout/Lovell	Virgin River	Virgin River Trout/Lovell	Trout/Lovell	Virgin River	
FY 85	Ireteba Peaks	Eldorado Valley	Eldorado			Eldorado Valley Las Vegas Dunes	Eldorado Mtn.		
FY 86	Jean Lake	Goodsprings Sheep Mtn.	Bird Spring			Jean/Ivanpah			
FY 87		California Wash	Muddy Mtn. Dry Lake Mtn.			Kyle/Lee	Muddy Mtn. Kyle/Lee		Muddy Mtn.
FY 88		Moapa Red Rock	Red Rock			Mt. Potosi	Mt. Potosi	Muddy River	
FY 89		Arrow Canyon	Arrow Canyon North Spring						
FY 90			Sunrise Newberry			Sunrise		Meadow Valley Wash	
FY 91			South Spring NY-Castle						

TABLE 3

Water Source*	Sec.	Township	Range	Quarter
1. Rabbit Sp. (Gov't Sp.)	15	70	9	NW
2. Seep Sp.	15	70	2	NW
3. Connolly Sp.	19	71	31	NE
4. Yellowstone Sp.	31	65	4	SE
5. Desert Queen Well	26	63	13	SW
6. Potosi Sp.	23	57	12	NW
7. Rattlesnake Sp.	16	71	28	NW
8. N. Key W. Sp.	15	71	16	SE
9. Red Rock Sp. #1-4	17	70	7,18	
10. Taylor Water Development	20	69	15	NW
11. Willow Sp.	20	69	12	
12. Twin Sp.	20	70	19	NW
13. Turkey Sp.	20	69	24	NW
14. Fairbanks Sp.	20	69	3	SE
15. Gann Sp.	20	69	15	SW
16. New Sp.	19	71	31	
17. Grapevine Sp.	19	70	34	SW
18. Scotts Well	28	61	7	NW
19. Grassy Sp.	18	58	32	SE
20. Mud Sp.	18	56	15	SE
21. Bullion Sp.	28	60	20	SE
22. Cottonwood Sp.	31	65	28	SE
23. Mud Sp. #2	22	58	15	SE
24. Mule Sp.	22	57	15	SW
25. Sheep Sp.	20	57	36	SW
26. Buck Sp.	18	55	35	SW

*Priorities may change through the HMP process.

TABLE 4
PROPOSED FENCES AND WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Christmas Tree Pass:
- Install water haul at Deep Well
- Install water haul at Battleaxe Well
- Install water haul at Coast Guard Loran Station
- Pipe water across U.S. Highway 93 from CalNevAri to present water haul site
- Redrill Juniper Well
- Install 2-3 miles of pipeline from Cottonwood Spring

Ireteba Peaks:
- Drill a well to replace service area of the 3 water hauls on the east side of U.S. Highway 93
- Install 3-4 miles of pipeline from Desert Queen Well south

Jean Lake:
- Improve McClanahan South Well
- Improve flow of Granite Springs
- Improve flow of Scotts Well Spring
- Install 1 mile of pipeline south from Jean Lake well
- Install pipeline 2-3 miles west from Calada Well
- Redrill old wells at millsite
- Build 5-6 miles of fence across Jean Lake

Kyle Canyon:
- Improve base waters to produce 300 gallons per AUM.

McCullough Mountain:
- Fence the east side of U.S. Highway 93 to Railroad Pass
- Install 2 miles of pipeline north from 10 Mile Well with 2 troughs
- Build a reservoir halfway between Searchlight and 10 Mile Well
- Install 1 mile of pipeline from mining claim in Crescent Peak allotment to a point 3.5 miles west of Little Well
- Make a holding corral in the Brewer Well area
- Build 4 miles of fence from west slope of the North Highland Range to the McCullough Range

Upper Mormon Mesa:
- Install approximately 4 miles of pipeline from Upper Mormon Mesa Well
- Restore Reservoir #2 which was abandoned.

Bunkerville:
- Install 8 miles of pipeline from Key West to the Black Ridge area
- Water haul north of Virgin River

Flat Top Mesa:
- Install a new well which would service the entire allotment

Crescent Peak:
- Increase storage at Cripple Jack Well
- Install another trough at 6 Mile Pipeline
- Drill a well in Monday Basin in California
- Develop water from CalNevAri
- Extend a pipeline from the YKL pipeline to replace the service area of Jack's Well

TABLE 5
RRCRL PROJECT SCHEDULE

FY81 -Interpretive Program Implementation
-Cooperative Management Agreement Working Plan (NDSP/BLM) Implementation
-Loop Drive Closure (after-hours)

FY82 -Trails Master Plan
-Update 1976 Master Plan
-Law Enforcement Cooperative Agreement/Contract and Working Plan
-Interpretive Prospectus
-Maintenance Program Implementation ('82-83)
-Brownstone Canyon Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Oak Creek Campground Design/Management Plan (NDSP)
-Full Operation of Visitor Center
-Environmental Education Program Implementation
-Initiate Summa Corp. Exchange (See R-1.7)

FY83 -Trail Design and begin Construction
-Implement Brownstone Canyon Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Red Rock Summit Road Management Plan/Decisions
-(NDSP)
-Sandstone Quarry, Pine Creek, White Rock Picnic Area Development
-Loop Drive Overlook Development (Fossil Dune, Sandstone Quarry, Whiterock)
-Loop Drive Seal/Chip Coat
-LaMadre Group-Use Area Development
-Land Acquisition/Exchange (Summa Corp).
-Backcountry Management Plan/Implementation

FY84 -Bicycle Trail Design
-Bootleg/Rainbow Springs Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Cave Area Management Plan
-Red Rock Summit Road Development (Lone Pine, Switchback, others)
-Oak Creek Campground Development (NDSP)

FY85 -Bicycle Trail Development
-Implement Bootleg/Rainbow Springs Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Cave Area Management Plan/Implementation Management

TABLE 6

Area	Species
Virgin Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep, mountain lion, mule deer
Virgin River Recreation Lands	Waterfowl
Las Vegas Wash	Waterfowl, raptors, songbirds
Eldorado Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep, wild burros
Cold Creek-Willow Creek	Songbirds, small mammals, wild horses and burros, mule deer, mountain lion
Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands	Songbirds, raptors, Desert bighorn sheep, wild burros
Newberry Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep

TABLE 7

AREA	COLLECTIBLES	GENERAL DESIRABILITY
Goodsprings	galen, cerrusite, anglesite, fossils, feldspar	excellent
Eldorado Mtns. (Nelson area)	Chalcedony roses, agate, copper minerals	excellent
Searchlight & Newberry Mtns.	agate, lead and silver minerals	excellent
Sunrise Mtn., Rainbow Gardens, Lava Butte	fossils (trilobites), jaspar, agate, geodes	good
River Mtns.	amethystine nodules	fair
McCullough Mtns. North	amethystine, quartz, agate, chalcedony roses, jaspar	good
Crescent Peak (New York Mtns.)	unakite, epodate, obsidian, geodes, chalcedony, turquoise	very good
Dead Mtns.	quartz, feldspar, garnet	good
Muddy Mtns.	amethystine, jaspar, opal, agate	good
Arrow Canyon	fossils, including coral	good
Virgin Mtns. (Key West and Silverleaf Mine Area)	beryl, nickel, schist, hornblendite, quartz lenses, pyrites	good
Gold Butte	petrified wood, mica, selenite roses, corals, brachiopods, bryophytes	very good
North Muddy Mtns. and Overton Ridge	petrified wood, quartz magnesite	good

TABLE 8
HUNTING POTENTIAL

Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Highland Range	Bighorn Quail			
Spring Mountains		Bighorn Quail		Chukar Mule Deer
Eldorado Mountains		Bighorn Quail		
Bird Spring Range			Bighorn	
Searchlight Area		Quail		
Las Vegas Wash		Quail		Waterfowl
Newberry Mountains		Bighorn Quail		Mule deer
McCullough Range		Bighorn		
Castle Mountains			Bighorn Quail	
Moapa Valley	Quail	Waterfowl (private lands)		
Arrow Canyon Range		Bighorn		
Gold Butte		Quail		
Muddy Mountains		Bighorn		
Virgin River			Quail Waterfowl	
Virgin Mountains			Quail	

TABLE 9

Recommended approximate boundaries for each RAMP area is as follows:

Area	Boundaries
Cold Creek/Wheeler Wash:	North - 5,000' elevation and Mt. Stirling WSA East - 5,000' elevation South - Wallace Canyon West - Boundary of Mt. Stirling WSA
Trout/Lovell Canyons:	North - Toiyabe National Forest East - RRCRL boundary South - Pahrump highway West - Wallace Canyon
Kyle/Lee Canyons:	North - North boundary of Desert View N.A. East - approximately 5,000' elevation South - boundary of LaMadre Mountains WSA West - USFS boundary
Mt. Potosi:	North - Pahrump Highway (S.R. 161) East - Cottonwood Pass road South - Wilson Pass road West - Approximately 5,000' level

Objective 1.0:
Eliminate management problems created by Federal ownership of lands needed for local urban-suburban growth. While emphasizing the Las Vegas Valley area, provide public lands for the expansion of communities and developed areas throughout Clark County. In these areas, public lands should be disposed of as rapidly as practical by sale, R&PP, exchange, or by other appropriate authority to accommodate development needs. These disposals should be accomplished with minimal management or compliance responsibility remaining with BLM. All such disposals should be accomplished in coordination with local government.

Rationale:
The Bureau is not the proper agency to oversee the development of urban-suburban areas. Local government, particularly in the case of the Las Vegas Valley, is better staffed, funded, equipped, and experienced in matters of urban development. Retaining Federal ownership of lands needed for community expansion creates problems for BLM, which is not equipped to properly administer such lands, and for the community, which finds this Federal ownership a block to orderly growth. Disposal eliminates both problems identified, and generates revenue for the general public by selling lands not manageable under established BLM programs.

The inclusion of reversionary stipulations not required by law in patents and R&PP leases simply serves to continue this management problem for both the Bureau and community.

In Public Law 96-586 (The Santini-Burton Act), Congress took note of the intermingling of public and private lands in urban areas of Clark County and observed that certain of these lands should be sold to promote the orderly development of those communities. Moreover, Sec. 203 of Public Law 94-579 (FLPMA) provides for disposal of public lands when such conditions exist that make Federal management difficult and disposal would meet important public purposes such as community expansion.

43 CFR 2400 discusses classification of public land for disposal, and Subpart 2430.5 sets criteria for classification of lands valuable for residential, commercial, agricultural, or industrial purposes. This section requires that disposal be consistent with local government plans. In 43 CFR 1725.2 is the requirement that transfer of public lands out of Federal ownership be done in the most efficient manner possible.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective meets the management needs of the Bureau as well as policy guidance provided by Congress in FLPMA (Sec. 202) and in the Santini-Burton Act of 1980, regarding disposal of public land in the Las Vegas Valley. It would have positive economic and social benefits in Southern Nevada.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:
Dispose of all lands within the Las Vegas Valley identified on the Las Vegas Valley Sub-Unit MFP 1 Disposal Opportunities Overlay. Disposal to be accomplished by sale, R&PP, or other appropriate authority.

Support Needs:
Appraisals, clerical support, cadastral survey, Cultural Resources, and minerals.

Rationale:
These lands are needed for the expansion of urban Las Vegas, cited in the 1980 census as one of the top ten growth cities in the United States. The lands are not identified as needed for any Federal program. In addition, no existing BLM program could effectively manage this area. Processing of use authorizations in this area is a constant workload. The problems of illegal occupancy, dumping, and other trespass are rampant, and would be eliminated by disposal. Retention of these lands puts the Bureau in the de facto position of being an urban planning agency, for which it is ill equipped.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Watershed 2.1 and 2.2)

Disposal of these lands would conflict with Minerals recommendation 1.3, to establish sand and gravel pits in the Las Vegas Valley. The intensive construction and development taking place in Las Vegas has resulted in a need for exploitable sand and gravel sources. The disposal of lands needed for these pits, or the disposal of lands adjacent to them could prevent or conflict with use of the sand and gravel deposits.

Forestry recommendation 1.2 suggests leasing lands to nurserymen to produce desert vegetation, the goal being to decrease domestic water consumption through use of desert ornamental plants. Disposal of lands in the Las Vegas area would preclude short-term leasing. While such leases outside the Valley may be appropriate, the per-acre value of Valley parcels would likely make such use unprofitable for the lessee as well as a BLM management burden.

Watershed recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 call attention to requirements to consider floodplains in disposal actions. Clark County does have an active floodplain management agency.

The opportunities for multiple use management, under existing BLM programs, in the Las Vegas Valley are nil. The urban character of the area makes management for recreation, forestry, livestock grazing, wildlife, and most mineral production impractical.

(Lands 1.1 continued)

As documented in the Clark County Planning Area Analysis, the public will continue to demand sale or disposal of public lands in the Las Vegas Valley. The passage and positive reception of the Burton-Santini Act (requiring sale of Las Vegas Valley Federal lands) is an example of the public's perception that continued Federal ownership of lands in the Las Vegas Valley is inappropriate. Clark County URA data showed that local officials perceive a real need for these sales, with emphasis on orderly, well-managed disposal.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Dispose of all public lands within the Las Vegas Valley with priority to the Santini-Burton Act area, identified on the Las Vegas Valley Sub-Unit MFP 1 Disposal Opportunities Overlay. To provide maximum management flexibility, all disposal will be by the most appropriate authority available. Parcels needed for sand and gravel pits or adjacent to sand and gravel pits will be disposed of on a lowest priority basis, with parcels in high density developed areas disposed of first. Consider Clark County to have met the requirements for ability to maintain or restore beneficial floodplain values. All disposals will be in coordination with local government officials and agencies.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Continued disposal of public lands in the Las Vegas Valley is perceived by local citizens and officials as being necessary to assure orderly and manageable growth of the urban area. Accomplishing disposals by whatever authority is most appropriate in an individual situation will permit the needed flexibility in accommodating the diverse needs of the Las Vegas urban area. Disposing of gravel pit areas last, after the removal of the valuable aggregate, will insure a continued supply of these materials to the public and the construction industry at reasonable costs.

Alternative Considered:
Retain all lands in Federal ownership.

Recommendation 1.2:
Dispose of all public lands within the following communities through sale, exchange, R&PP, or other appropriate authority by 1990. This disposal would be undertaken to accommodate community expansion, and to eliminate isolated parcels of public land surrounded predominately by private lands.

1) Indian Springs
2) Goodsprings
3) Searchlight
4) Nelson

Support Needs:
Appraisal, clerical, cadastral survey, minerals, cultural resources.

Rationale:
These lands have not been identified as needed for any Federal program. Existing BLM programs cannot provide effective management of these lands. In addition, continued Federal ownership of these parcels tends to place an artificial limit upon orderly growth and economic development. The establishment of the original townsite assumed eventual private ownership of all small parcels therein. However, repeal of the townsite and small tract authorities prevented continued disposal.

Multiple Use Analysis

No specific parcels have been identified, and therefore no specific conflicts have emerged. Howaever, disposal in certain areas may conflict with other programs and MFP recommendations. Generally, however, the acreages in question are too small to significantly impact existing multiple use programs or seriously conflict with other MFP recommendations intending for public lands to remain open or in a protected status. In reality, most BLM management programs are inappropriate in and around existing settled suburban areas.

The minor losses to other resources by these disposals would be more than offset by the positive socio-economic benefits. The Clark County PAA clearly identifies the presence of continued demand for public lands in and around communities. In addition, public attitudes clearly support BLM disposal of these small parcels of public lands in and around growing communities. The Clark County URA data reflects the concern of local government that orderly growth of these communities is hampered by the presence of public lands within and adjacent to their communities.

(Lands 1.2 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Dispose of all public parcels within the settled limits of the following communities:

1) Indian Springs
2) Goodsprings
3) Searchlight
4) Nelson

Disposal of these parcels should be on an as-needed basis, and should be accomplished by the most appropriate disposal authority. All disposals should be in coordination with local government, with the goal of complete disposal in the communities completed by 1990, unless sound management or statutory constraints preclude meeting this deadline.

Reason:

Continued disposal of lands in and around existing communities will provide for needed "growing room" for these towns, while satisfying the public's strong desire to see these disposals take place. In addition, the management problems confronting BLM in its stewardship of these lands (e.g., trespass, right-of-way processing, etc.) will be eliminated. The blocking of Federal and private lands has long been recognized as a desirable management objective.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Retain lands in Federal ownership.
2. Dispose of lands by Indian Springs.

Recommendation 1.3:
Through appropriate authority, transfer into private ownership by the year 2000 all isolated parcels of public lands of 160 or less coterminous acres within the following general settlement areas:

1) Eastern Pahrump Valley
2) Mountain Springs Community
3) Sandy (Mesquite Valley) Community
4) Jean
5) Sloan and "Sloan Turn-Off" areas
6) Blue Diamond
7) Moapa Valley Area
8) Virgin Valley Area
9) Kyle Canyon Road Small Tract Area
10) Laughlin

Support Needs:
Appraisal, clerical, cadastral survey.

Rationale:
These lands have not been identified as needed for other Federal programs. Existing BLM programs cannot effectively manage these isolated parcels surrounded predominately by private lands. In many situations, use authorization and pursuit of trespasses consumes far more manpower and administrative resources than are ever returned to the public through resource management. Disposal would also allow expansion of existing and growing communities and satisfy the goal of "blocking" Federal and private holdings. In many of these areas, small communities are completely "landlocked" by Federal lands. Transferring into private ownership the small parcels of public land within these communities would effectively respond to the pressure for expansion which now exists.

Multiple Use Analysis

Disposal of public lands in and around established communities generally eliminates BLM management problems, does not significantly detract from BLM programs, allows for community expansion, and satisfies the public's perception that such lands belong in private hands, available for development. The same factors and information sources cited in Lands recommendations 1.1 and 1.2 also apply here, and need not be repeated.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Through appropriate authority, transfer out of Federal ownership all isolated parcels of 160 or less coterminous acres in those general settlement areas listed in this recommendation. Total blocking of public and private lands by the year 2000 should be a reasonable goal, but not a mandatory deadline.

Reason:
The reasons for disposing of these lands are the same as cited for recommendations 1.1 and 1.2. While using the year 2000 as a desirable projected date for completion of disposals, all disposal should be on an as-needed basis, and should be accomplished in coordination with local government.

(Lands 1.3 continued)

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Retain lands in Federal ownership.

Recommendation 1.4:
Provide public lands for short-term lease (not to exceed 10 years) under P.L. 94-579, upon request, when all the following conditions are in effect:

1) The parcel is adjacent to or in proximity to private lands, unless an overriding need is documented.
2) Local government approves of the lease.
3) No BLM resource management program would be adversely affected.
4) Leasing is preferable to sale because of the anticipation that the land will appropriately be returned to the pool of open public lands at a later date.
5) Disposal by sale is not appropriate.

Support Needs:
Appraisal, clerical support, cadastral survey, cultural resources.

Rationale:
In many situations lands not suitable for final disposal by sale are needed by groups, individuals, or firms for legitimate and worthwhile purposes not readily accommodated under TUP or R/W authorities. Allowing these uses under short-term lease would provide lands for residential, agricultural, commercial, or other uses for limited periods without altering the land ownership pattern permanently.

This action would allow BLM to be more responsive to the needs of the public. The short-term nature of the leases would be well suited to the constant changes in land use patterns created by mining, mineral development, ranching, farming, recreation, and ownership for eventual return to open status.

The 10-year limit reflects a midground between the five-year lease review, with option to renew, under the R&PP regulations and the 20-year right-of-way review provision. A lease term longer than 10 years would imply a permanence factor not intended. A sale would probably be more appropriate under those circumstances.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes, Forestry 1.2 and Watershed 1.2 and 4.7)

Leasing of public lands for short-term private/commercial use would take place primarily in rural areas where no private land base exists, since the goal in urban/suburban areas is to dispose of public holdings. Such leases could conflict with wildlife (Range Management 1.1), livestock grazing (Range Management 1.1), mining (Minerals 1.1), or other uses in these areas of primarily solid-block public ownership.

(Lands 1.4 continued)

Nonetheless, overriding socio-economic considerations may in some instances, justify such a lease, even to the detriment of competing resource values or programs. In many cases, such leases would have little or no impact upon existing or potential BLM programs, and would satisfy needs for lands to accommodate useful private or commercial facilities. The PAA clearly identifies the public perception that the BLM is unresponsive to needs for public lands for private and commercial uses.

Leasing lands for short-term use, under the conditions spelled out in the recommendation above, would not permanently remove lands from public ownership. Regulations have established that leasing for various private and commercial uses is indeed BLM policy, if need is justified and impacts are adequately assessed and mitigated.

One such use of leased land would be for development of nurseries for propagation of desert plants for use in landscaping in Las Vegas (WS 1.2 and Forestry 1.2). While the concept has merit as a water conservation incentive, it would not be appropriate for BLM to actively promote such leases. Such a proposal, however, if generated from the private sector, should be evaluated on its overall merits as any other application would.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Grant leases to accommodate private and commercial uses on a case-by-case, as-needed basis, in keeping with BLM policy. Be guided in leasing by the conditions listed in recommendation 1.4.

Reason:
Situations arise wherein a positive benefit may be derived by accomplishing a short-term lease as outlined above. To maintain a visible responsiveness to public needs and allow for necessary development, some private/commercial leases will be desirable. This will help satisfy the steady stream of requests for such leases received by BLM. The Clark County PAA projects that these lease requests will continue to be received. The development of any portion of the proposed MX missile project would greatly increase this demand for leases for support facilities and businesses. With this lease authority and the guidelines mentioned, BLM will be in a favorable position to accommodate needed facilities.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
No leasing.

Recommendation 1.5:
Permanently close to livestock grazing public lands in Las Vegas Valley bordered by the following allotments(A) or Federal withdrawals: Dry Lake(A), Muddy Mountains(A), Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ireteba Peaks(A), McCullough Mountains(A), Hidden Valley(A), Spring Mountain(A), Kyle Canyon(A), Lucky Strike(A), and the Desert National Wildlife Range (to Indian Springs). Initiate the closure during FY83.

Support Needs:
Range staff; Congressional concurrence.

Rationale:
This area of the District is currently unallotted. Within Las Vegas Valley proper, livestock grazing would be strongly incompatible with the burgeoning growth, particularly in so far as Nevada is an open range state. Along the north side of U.S. Highway 93, the narrowness of the public land area would invite damaging trespass on the Desert National Wildlife Range and the Nellis Bombing and Gunnery Range. In addition, grazing on this area would promote dangerous confrontations between livestock and motorists on Highway 93. Congressional concurrence is required under Sec. 202(e)(2) of P.L. 94-579 when a major use is excluded from 100,000 or more acres of public land.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 2.0:
In areas suitable for agriculture, provide public lands for agricultural use through appropriate authority. Also, provide public lands through appropriate authority in agricultural areas for residential and commercial use to avoid loss of productive farm lands.

Rationale:
Farm operations are an important element of several smaller communities in Clark County, particularly the Moapa-Glendale-Overton area and the Sandy or Mesquite Valley area. While agriculture is not a major economic factor county-wide, it is a major social and economic factor in these outlying communities. Should water be available for agriculture, these areas, of all in the county, would most likely be prepared to make use of it.

At the same time, these communities are experiencing moderate growth rates. The loss of productive croplands in these areas due to population increases has and will continue to have an adverse effect upon agriculture, partly due to the "landlocked" nature of these areas, surrounded, as they are, by Federal lands.

According to 43 CFR 2430.5, public lands valuable for agricultural uses should be classified for the purpose which represents "this 'highest and best use' of the lands, i.e., their most profitable legal use in private ownership."

Multiple Use Analysis

As written, the objective meets Bureau policy and guidance provided in FLPMA (Sec. 202, 203). As an effort to protect an important rural life style in Clark County, it would be very favorably received by Southern Nevadans.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:

In areas suitable for establishment or expansion of agricultural operations, both conventional and experimental, provide public lands (not to exceed 320 acres per individual) through lease, or dispose through appropriate authority, to accommodate agricultural use.

Support Needs:

Economic, soil, and water evaluations of candidate areas; clerical, cultural resources, minerals.

Rationale:

Agriculture is an important contributor to the economy of many rural areas of Clark County. Existing agricultural entry authorities are extremely limiting in scope, acreage, and development constraints. Leasing of agricultural lands would provide needed management flexibility to allowing economic growth and development in this sector.

In addition, areas such as Glendale, Moapa, Overton, and others have experienced a net loss in productive cropland in recent years due to residential expansion. Expansion of agriculture onto suitable public lands would adjust for this trend, and allow full utilization of water and other resources.

Multiple Use Analysis

Lease or disposal of public lands for agricultural use would conflict with numerous resource recommendations, including Minerals (1.2), Range Management (1.2, 1.4), Watershed (2.1, 2.2,2.3), and Wildlife (2.1, 2.2). The underlying conflict with these various recommendations is, simply, the conflict between retention for management of a specific resource as opposed to disposal or elimination of BLM management controls to allow for private use.

Certain areas of Clark County contain potential agricultural lands which have little or no value for other resources or uses. Conversely, certain potential agricultural lands may contain valuable minerals, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, or other values. In some cases, these lands could be best managed by retention as public lands.

There are instances, however, where the availability of water, satisfactory soil conditions, minor impact on other resource values, and socio-economic benefits make such agricultural use the most advantageous use of the land. Some environmental effects will result whenever unused lands are brought under cultivation. Still, the positive socio-economic impacts, particularly to

(Lands 2.1 continued)

rural, agricultural communities, would often outweigh the negative environmental impacts. The Clark County PAA clearly identifies the importance of the rural lifestyle of these communities to the residents, as well as the problems created by depletion of the agricultural land base because of residential expansion.

One area where agricultural use might create significant impacts to wildlife habitat is in the Muddy and Virgin River areas.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

By appropriate authority, lease or dispose of lands determined suitable for agricultural production or experimentation, where significant impacts to other resources would not result. Leases or disposals in excess of 320 acres per individual require justification of the increased acreage. Lease or dispose of no lands in the Muddy or Virgin River floodplains until completion of an adequate HMP, scheduled for 1984.

Reason:

Greater flexibility is needed in accommodating new agricultural production and experimentation than is provided by existing agricultural entry laws. Still, limiting such leases and disposals to 320 acres, as a general guideline, will be consistent with those agricultural entry laws still in effect.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Dispose only through DLE or Carey Acts.
2. No agricultural lease.

Recommendation 2.2:
Provide public lands under appropriate authority for commercial, industrial, and residential use in existing agricultural areas. These areas include, but are not limited to:

1) Pahrump Valley (Eastern)
2) Sandy (Mesquite) Valley
3) Virgin River Valley
4) Moapa - Logandale area

Support Needs:
Appraisal, clerical, cadastral survey, cultural resources, minerals.

Rationale:
Agriculture is important to the economy and lifestyle of these areas. For the most part, private lands are in use as cropland. The continued population growth of these areas would require development of farmlands for residential-commercial use unless public lands are made available as recommended. Continued loss of productive farmland to development creates many negative impacts to the socio-economic base of rural communities.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation complements Lands MFP Step 2 Multiple Use Recommendations 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1. Generally speaking, developed agricultural areas may be considered as solely committed to agricultural and residential use. Parcels of public lands within these areas usually have little value for BLM multiple use management.

The Clark County PAA describes the negative socio-economic impacts that result when agricultural lands in these small communities are developed for residential and commercial use. Such a transition can prove devastating to overall agricultural production, and can alter the basic lifestyle of the entire community.

Conflicts which may arise would be the same as those listed for the Step 2 Multiple Use Recommendations noted above. In some instances, even major socio-economic motivation may be overridden by acute environmental problems. Case-by-case examination of lease or disposal opportunities would identify such conflicts.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
In those areas identified, provide public lands to accommodate commercial, industrial, and residential uses in agricultural communities. Each lease/disposal

Reason:
Accommodating commercial, industrial, and residential uses by leasing or disposing of public lands in these agricultural areas, without creating significant environmental impacts,

(Lands 2.2 continued)

opportunity will be examined individually to assure that the most advantageous use of the land takes place.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

would help preserve the economic and social basis of the communities. This would be accomplished by allowing productive cropland and existing farms to remain.

Alternative Considered:
Allow continued conversion of agricultural lands to other purposes.

Objective 3.0:
Provide public lands in Clark County for transportation, energy transmission, communications, and related facilities and systems through appropriate authority.

Rationale:
The need to provide public lands or the use of public lands to accommodate these systems and facilities is based on the geographic location of Clark County between the population centers of Southern California and energy-producing areas of the Rocky Mountains. Southern California is a major energy user. Currently, the demand is satisfied by imported oil, but a shift is slowly occurring to U.S.-produced energy. The fossil fuels of Utah and Wyoming are a key potential source. Because of the major corridor obstacles posed by the Nellis Range, Nevada Test Site, Desert National Wildlife Range, Lake Mead National Recreation Area and Grand Canyon National Park, Clark County is the principal route between the supply and demand areas.

The rapid growth of Las Vegas causes a similar energy, transportation, and communications requirement to satisfy local needs for these services.

P.L. 94-579 (FLPMA), in Section 503, calls for common use of rights-of-way wherever possible to minimize adverse environmental impacts and avoid corridor proliferation.

Under 43 CFR 1725-3-3(e) the BLM is charged with administration: "Management of public lands for occupancy involves the protection, regulated use, and development of lands as sites for economically and socially useful structures, either publicly or privately owned."

Multiple Use Analysis

This use of public lands is consistent with a host of laws regarding rights-of-way and with Title V of FLPMA. It offers real, needed services to Clark County residents.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 3.1:

Limit issuance of major transportation system R/Ws to corridors shown in the Nevada Transportation and Utility Corridor Study (under preparation by BLM Nevada State Office). Allow major system construction outside these corridors only when severe use conflicts, engineering constraints, or negation of the system's purpose would result from using the existing corridor. Minor deviation, widening, or alteration of the corridor should not be considered as "outside of corridor" construction.

"Major systems" means the following facilities:
Electrical = 66 kv or above
Pipelines = 6" diameter or larger
Highways = Paved highways in excess of one travel lane each direction
Railroads = All
Interstate Telephone Toll Lines = All

Support Needs:

NSO Study completion.

Rationale:

Use of identified or designated corridors would minimize adverse impacts associated with transmission line proliferation and avoid isolating, and thereby restricting multiple uses on, parcels of public lands.

Multiple Use Analysis

Southern Nevada lies in the path between the energy-consuming West Coast and the energy-producing Rocky Mountains of Utah and Wyoming. As a result, numerous existing and proposed utility systems cross Clark County. Every such system creates numerous resource conflicts which must be analyzed and mitigated. In some instances, socio-economic factors result in some

(Lands 3.1 continued)

environmental degradation, while in other instances, special environmental values result in rerouting or special mitigation of impacts.

Limiting system construction to established corridors is usually desirable from a multiple use standpoint. However, the referenced Nevada Transportation and Utility Corridor Study has not been completed, so identification of specific conflicts or values is not possible. Further, different types of systems may create different impacts within the same corridor, and result in very different effects upon competing or existing uses.

Particular problems exist in Las Vegas Valley. The intensive urban development, plus a variety of other constraints, make the Valley a true critical path along the Southern Nevada corridor route to Southern California. The most likely route--Sunrise Mountain-Las Vegas Wash-Henderson-McCullough Station--is rapidly reaching its apparent capacity. A proposal in Congress to sell the public land in the Henderson corridor to the city, could complicate the right-of-way process.

The completion of a comprehensive EIS covering the corridor study, or an EIS for each major system, would serve to identify use conflicts and impacts.

Multiple Use Recommendation:	Reason:
Do not establish utility system corridors until the completion of the Nevada Transportation and Utility Corridor Study. In the interim, grant system rights-of-way on an individual basis.	It would be inappropriate to accept the corridor study as the decision even before the study is completed and before the completion of environmental review. Granting systems on a case-by-case basis will allow adequate assessment of each project.
Support Needs:	Alternative Considered:
NSO Completion of Study; EIS/EA.	Manage Clark County under the "window-sensitive area" concept.

Recommendation 3.2:
Promote expansion and multi-user growth of existing communication sites where technical considerations allow. Designate and grant applications for use of new sites only upon justification that existing sites are unfeasible technically or economically. New sites should, of course, be developed as required and authorized pursuant to appropriate authority.

Rationale:
Advances in electronics technology has permitted much greater development of communication sites for multiple users formerly required to be separated by physical distance depending on the size of the facilities. This trend can be expected to continue. However, increased use of two-way, microwave, satellite, and other radiation communication systems can be expected to increase as well. Thus, further development of existing sites must be coordinated with development of new sites.

Multiple Use Analysis

The advancements of electronics and the increased use of two-way, microwave, satellite, and other communication systems is perpetuating the need for communication sites upon BLM lands. The use of existing sites is preferred, so that adverse impacts from construction, ingress and egress, installation, maintenance, etc., is minimized. New sites should only be considered when the user demonstrates that a new site is the only viable alternative. This recommendation conflicts with the migration routes and habitat of the bighorn sheep by allowing additional sites (Wildlife 1.37). The expansion of communication sites could conflict with efforts to reintroduce bighorn sheep into historical sites (Wildlife 2.4). The use of additional sites could conflict with the use of the sites for hang gliding (Recreation 2.7).

The restriction on approving new sites complements the recommendations (see Fire 1.2 and 1.4) to minimize fire losses by planning and pre-attack plans. It is also supported by the recommendation to restrict development in elk and bighorn sheep habitat.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written with the additional requirement that, unless road access exists to a

Reason:
The recommendation serves the growing communication needs of Southern Nevada while minimizing impacts to other

(Lands 3.2 continued)

proposed new site, access will be by helicopter only.

Support Needs:
Wildlife, VRM Programs.

resource uses. Helicopter access to new sites will assure that only the required site is disturbed.

Alternative Considered:
All road access to new sites.

Recommendation 3.3:
Where appropriate, grant airport lease applications for airport facilities within Clark County to increase the access by and qualities of air services in rural Clark County and to augment existing airport facilities. Solicit local government and public input with the goals of:

1) Establish new or expanded airport facilities where such would be in the public's interest.
2) Avoid proliferation of airport leases within limited geographic areas or where such facilities would have no real value to the public, but would in fact serve only a private individual or firm.

Rationale:
The need for air services for commercial, private, and emergency purposes will continue to grow as a result of increased development of rural areas far from population centers. Growth of established communities will also require expansion of existing airports. The Bureau must be responsive to these needs since in many areas of Clark County sufficient private land for airport construction is not available at a reasonable price. In addition, the public demand for and recent growth of "air ambulance" and related emergency services will require establishment of additional airport facilities to serve various geographic areas.

Multiple Use Analysis

The needs for and uses of air travel in Southern Nevada are increasing. Air service is critical to the social, medical, communication, and economic functions of many communities. These factors, combined with the projected population increases and BLM's commitment to utilize public lands for public projects, will increase the number of applications for new or increased airport facilities. Prior to granting approval of these applications BLM must coordinate with Clark County officials to insure the project meets their approval. Approval of air facilities should be in concert with Clark County planning.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written, with emphasis upon coordination with local officials.

Reasons:
Expansion of air facilities on BLM lands will be needed. The high cost of facilities requires coordination with Clark County. This practice is consistent with current management objectives and goals.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Requiring use of existing facilities.

Recommendation 3.4:	Rationale:
Make no designations under 43 CFR 8342, and take no other actions on public lands, which would limit off- or on-road vehicle access to existing withdrawals, leases, private lands, rights-of-way, or other improvement or facilities; or to lands under application or potentially useful for such facilities.	The distances and conditions found in Clark County are such that any limitations on vehicle use as outlined in this recommendation would place undue hardship on users of public lands as well as on BLM in its management of these lands.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 1.0:
Manage public lands in Clark County so as to facilitate exploration and development of leasable, locatable, and salable minerals.

Rationale:
United States law and Federal regulations encourage the exploration and development of the nation's mineral resources. Recent international developments have generated "mineral" and "energy" crises which have prompted a government policy of freeing the United States from dependence on foreign mineral sources to the extent possible. In recent years, geologists have postulated that the Overthrust Belt, a geological formation believed to have high potential for oil and gas discoveries, runs through Southern Nevada.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective is consistent with Bureau policy and mineral laws. It would be favored by most Southern Nevadans as a positive management step.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Clark County

Minerals

Recommendation 1.1:
Manage all of the Federally-owned mineral estate in Clark County as open to mineral entry and to mineral leasing.

Support Needs:
All programs.

Rationale:
The Mining Law of 1872 grants, by law, the right of individuals to enter public lands and lay claim to and recover valuable minerals found there. The act, and its amendments, also authorizes certain occupancy and disturbance of surface lands to accomplish this recovery of "locatable" minerals. To preclude the exercise of these rights, the BLM must identify a clear conflict between mining operations and other surface resource values and withdraw the lands from operation of the mining laws.

Exploration for and development of leasable minerals on the public lands is authorized under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1921, as amended. This law, and regulations pursuant to it, give the BLM broad authority to grant or deny (for good cause) mineral leases and to regulate, through lease stipulations, the manner in which the exploration and development takes place. To preclude leasing applications in a given area, the BLM would have to obtain Congressional approval to withdraw the area from leasing.

To explore for and recover mineral resources on the public land has been public policy in the United States for decades. In recent years, it has been well established that the United States has a critical need to assure a continued supply of strategic and important energy and mineral raw materials to maintain our national

(continued)

social, economic, and defense requirements. It has been equally well established that the United States, to an inordinate degree, must depend on foreign sources for nearly half of its petroleum requirements and, for some key mineral raw materials, such as chromium, platinum, tin, and cobalt, as much as 80 to 90 percent of our needs are supplied by foreign sources. The problem generated by that fact is that the instability of some foreign areas, and, in some cases, a positive hostility towards the United States, could reduce or eliminate those areas as energy and mineral raw material sources in the future.

As a consequence of this dependency, it has been the policy of past and current administrations to make maximum use of resources within the United States, including those found on public lands, to supplant foreign sources.

The Clark County URA establishes that there are a wide variety of actual or potential mineral finds in the county. Historical mining districts, mainly for gold and silver and associated minerals, blanket the county, from the Searchlight District in the south to the Gold Butte District in the northeast and the Mount Stirling District in the northwest. The fact that these are known mineralized areas, makes the likelihood of discoveries of valuable mineral deposits very high. Considering leasable minerals, Clark County is an area of high oil and gas activity because of the presence of the Overthrust Belt, a geological structure believed to have very high potential for oil and gas discoveries.

Most of the public lands mineral estate in the county is either under lease or has a lease application on it. Geophysical work to delineate likely oil and gas reservoirs is very intense.

To accommodate this exploration and development of mineral resources, and to minimize or mitigate adverse impacts on other surface resource values, several laws and regulations have been set in place. The surface management regulations (43 CFR 3809) give BLM the responsibility to require and oversee the reclamation of lands disturbed by mining activities. In advance of such activities, BLM has an opportunity to review mining operation plans and recommend changes to plan elements which would unduly cause adverse impacts to other resources. BLM has a similar opportunity to review and seek changes in plans to conduct oil and gas geophysical (seismic) work under 43 CFR 3045, which requires firms to provide the Bureau "notice of intent" to undertake such activity.

The Bureau has several opportunities to review proposals for oil and gas exploration. During the lease application stage, the Bureau can review areas to be leased for critical resources likely to be impacted and set certain stipulations on issued leases as general conditions of exploration and development which would protect such resource values. A similar opportunity for the Bureau comes with the review of the U.S. Geological Survey's environmental assessment of the Application for Permit to Drill (APD). The National

(Minerals 1.1 continued)

Environmental Policy Act requires these assessments to assure that impacts are identified to decision makers who thereby can take actions to mitigate those impacts.

In summary, there is a demonstrated need for energy and mineral resources development on public lands in Clark County; there is national policy which encourages such development, and there are ample analysis mechanisms available to offset adverse impacts to other resource values on a case-by-case basis, all of which warrants the conclusion stated in the recommendation.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Wildlife 1.2, 1.10, 1.39, 3.1, and 3.2)

Numerous resource values have been identified as in conflict with mineral operations, i.e., oil, gas, and geothermal exploration, sand and gravel operations, and locatable mineral claims.

Wildlife recommendations 1.2, 3.1, and 3.2, address the limitation and/or prohibition of mining activities in crucial bighorn and desert tortoise habitat. All mining activities are viewed as threatening to bighorn sheep, especially in lambing and critical summer habitats, where such activities pressure sheep to avoid these important areas. Road development which provides access to mining areas, also opens up these areas to recreationists thereby adding to potential disturbance to these animals.

In critical desert tortoise habitat, road development for mining access is viewed as a major problem. By limiting activities, particularly seismic, to existing roads, trails, and washes, and by restricting activity to a time when tortoises are least vulnerable, during hibernation, this problem could be alleviated. Where habitat is disturbed in critical wildlife habitat, reclamation of the area through revegetation and road closure could greatly reduce any serious impacts to these animals.

Unique riparian habitat along the Virgin River could be adversly impacted if new oil and gas development and sand and gravel operations are permitted along adjacent public lands (Wildlife 1.39). The river has been identified as critical habitat to several native fish species including the endangered Woundfin (Plagopterus argentissimus) and Moapa Dace (Moapa coriacea). The Endangered Species Act of 1973 provides for the protection of these species.

(Minerals 1.1 continued)

Mitigating habitat disturbance by mining activities is not important exclusively to protected and endangered wildlife species. Studies have shown that specific desert washes support a wide variety and high density of wild bird species; in addition to the Gila monster, listed as rare by the State (refer to Nongame Bird URA III Overlay). Seismic activity as well as competitive ORV use can greatly impact significant riparian vegetation found in these areas and found to be important in providing food, cover, and nesting habitat. In addition to the protection offered these species and their habitat by Federal and State law, BLM Manual 6740 also provides for protection through buffer zones along riparian zones (Wildlife 1.10).

Mining activities in Clark County also present a point of conflict to the recreation resource. The Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands, designated in 1967 and provided with management guidelines and directives in the mid-1970s, have been recognized as a potential source of extensive oil and gas reserves (Recreation 1.6). In June of 1980 the final draft of the Environmental Assessment of Oil and Gas Leasing in the RRCRL was released and has aided in reaffirming the direction of managing these lands as a prime recreation area.

Mining activities where aesthetic values are altered through surface disturbance would create a conflict to the establishment of natural areas in Clark County. Natural areas, set aside to preserve scientific and educational values and to promote the area for recreational uses should be protected in their existing condition as much as possible (Recreation 1.1). Natural areas in Clark County are the Pine Creek Research Natural Area, the Desert View Natural Environmental Area (Recreation 1.1), and the Virgin Mountain Natural Area (Recreation 1.3). Additionally, the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) has established a National Scenic Area contiguous to the Las Vegas District boundary. Until such time that a determination is made to continue the Scenic Area on the Nevada side of the state line, it is recommended that this acreage be protected (Recreation 1.9).

Pending admission to the National Preservation System, careful impact analysis is recommended for activities carried out in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). The interim management policy for lands under wilderness review does not preclude mining operations from taking place within a WSA (Recreation 7.1). It is felt that direct conflicts would be realized if surface disturbance was permitted.

Surface disturbance through mining presents a profound conflict in areas where cultural resource values are high or fragile soil conditions exist. In Clark County, the archaeological resource is rich in many locations. By disturbing the surface in such areas, the resource can be totally lost by actual destruction of relics or alteration of a site. In areas where high erosion conditions or hazards have been identified, care should be taken in maintaining the highest level of ground cover possible (Watershed 4.5). By limiting use in these areas, allowing minimum surface disturbance, protection could be afforded the watershed resource.

(Minerals 1.1 continued)

The public views the conflicts between mineral operations and other resource values with mixed emotions. There are extremes on both sides of the question. Most Southern Nevadans would most likely take the issue on a case-by-case basis and make judgements related to specific instances. Thus, there was a great outpouring in defense of the recreational uses inside Red Rock Canyon against oil and gas exploration, but little concern expressed about the gypsum mining operations on the opposite side of Blue Diamond Hill from Red Rocks (PAA).

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows: Manage all of the Federally owned mineral estate in Clark County as open to mineral entry and to mineral licensing under the following guidelines:

1. Identify in all issued mineral leases, that impacts to crucial bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitat will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage.
2. Whenever possible, avoid surface disturbing activities under mineral entry 3809 plans of operations in bighorn sheep crucial summer habitat.
3. All roads created by mineral activities will be referred to the Area Manager for disposition prior to the end of the mineral activity.
4. Identify in all mineral leases issued in the floodplain of the Virgin River, that impacts to critical habitat of threatened or endangered species will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage as identified through "Section 7" consultation.
5. Identify in all mineral leases issued for those washes identified on the Nongame Bird URA III Overlay, that impacts to those washes will be subject to mitigative measures during the plan of operations stage.
6. Whenever possible, avoid surface occupancy on or within 1/4 mile of developed or designated recreational facilities.

Reason:

As stated in the rationale for this recommendation, there are opportunities under the 3809 regulations and during the review of mineral lease plans of operations, to offset undesirable impacts to other resources from the mineral activities.

(Minerals 1.1 continued)

7. Identify in all issued mineral leases, that operations planned for areas with "severe" or "critical" soil surface factors (SSF) and in areas with "moderate" and "slight" SSF and "high" erosion hazards, will be subject to special mitigative measures to offset impacts identified at the plan of operations stage.
8. Whenever possible, avoid surface occupancy on riparian zones.
9. Within crucial desert tortoise habitat, require mineral operators to identify and avoid, whenever possible, actual tortoise use areas (i.e., denning sites) prior to initiation of operations.
10. Within crucial desert tortoise habitat, require mineral operators to engage qualified wildlife biologists to search for and remove desert tortoises from operations sites prior to initiation of operations.
11. Avoid surface occupancy on relic stands of Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, bristlecone pine, and other relic plant communities.
12. In cooperation with Nevada Division of State Parks, make mineral leasing decisions for Valley of Fire State Park by mapping resource occurrence, as in the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands Oil and Gas Environmental Assessment, and using that document's impact matrix to develop lease stipulations.

Support Needs:

All resource activities, Nevada Division of State Parks, Nevada Department of Wildlife, holders of surface estate rights.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Close crucial areas to mineral leasing.
2. No surface occupancy in desert tortoise crucial habitat.

Recommendation 1.2:
Take no management actions on public lands which would prohibit vehicular access to known mineralized areas.

Support Needs:

Rationale:
The fact that valuable minerals are (or were at one time) being taken from an area indicates high economic potential. Vehicles are critical to the cost-effective exploration and development of mineral resources and should not be precluded from any of these areas.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.3:
Maintain four sand and gravel pits in the Las Vegas Valley for mineral material sales to the public, one in each quadrant of the Valley. Complete establishment by FY84. Evaluate every two years to determine if residential development encroachment warrants relocation.

Rationale:
The sand and gravel pits provide valuable services to the public. Maintenance of four pits will insure ready availability of such materials and minimize the workload on the staff geologists in responding to individual requests for salable mineral materials.

Support Needs:
Appraisal, survey.

Multiple Use Analysis

The 1980 census shows metropolitan Las Vegas as the second-fastest growing city in the U.S. Rapid growth requires adequate aggregate to support the construction of new facilities. Current private sources are being depleted and future construction will depend heavily upon BLM lands as sources of supply. It is desirable to minimize transportation costs, therefore, sites should be dispersed throughout the Las Vegas Valley. This urban expansion requires periodic review and possible site relocation to avoid unneccessary conflict with population expansion.

This recommendation conflicts with Public Law 96-586 (Santini-Burton Bill) which identifies land to be sold within specific boundaries. It also conflicts with Lands 1.1 which calls for disposal of most lands within Las Vegas Valley.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation to exclude all sites within the boundaries established by Public Law 96-586.

Reason:
This practice is within the guidelines and objectives of good management to provide service to the public at minimal cost. It addresses the intent of Public Law 96-586.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None

Recommendation 1.4:
By FY84, identify potential sand and gravel pits near each rural community in Clark County which does not currently have one.

Support Needs:
None

Rationale:
Growth of these communities will likely lead to a request for sales of mineral materials. Preliminary work would allow the District to respond quickly to public demand.

Multiple Use Analysis

Many rural communities depend heavily upon BLM lands as a source for sand and gravel. It is imperative to the growth and development of these communities that community pits be identified. The sites need to be located such that transportation costs are minimized. Prime sources must be identified to eliminate potential conflicts with DLE and R&PP applications, and private and governmental sales. Maximum coordination with community and Clark County entities will insure BLM actions and planning meet the needs and objectives of local planning.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
This meets the goals and objectives of good public land management for maximizing multiple use.

Alternative Considered:
None

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Objective 1.0:
Manage the existing public lands in Clark County to partially meet the demand of the Las Vegas metropolitan area for woodland and desert vegetative products on a sustained yield basis.

Rationale:
The increasing cost of fossil fuels has and will continue to make firewood an attractive energy source in Clark County. This public demand warrants the development and implementation of a sound woodland management program in order to meet the increasing impacts generated by the collection of firewood.

Other demands for desert flora products are growing also. Increasing water costs and future loss of current supply margins will place greater emphasis on the use of water-conserving desert plants for landscaping in Las Vegas.

Multiple Use Analysis

Woodland products, particularly firewood, have had a growing demand from the Las Vegas Valley, particularly as costs have risen for fossil fuels. It is clear however, that Clark County forestry resources can only partially satisfy that demand. Thus, the "sustained yield" phrase brings the recommendation into conformance with policy found in FLPMA (Sec. 102(a)(2)) and is consistent with good resource management.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:

Develop, during FY83-84, a greenwood cutting program on the west side of the Spring Mountains, to include designation of units on slopes of 30% or less as areas to be open for cutting during the months of June through August. First cut should be accomplished in the summer of 1984. The remaining months the area shall be closed. The area cut in one year should be seeded the following autumn.

Support Needs:

Temporary manpower, recreational staff, U.S. Forest Service coordination, Division of Administration, Public Affairs.

Rationale:

There is a strong demand for firewood from the Las Vegas community. The demand is at its seasonal low during the summer months (PAA). By allowing cutting during this time, the Bureau would distribute the workload upon Bureau staff throughout the year. Also, roads should be more passable with less damage occuring due to off-road vehicular travel.

An essential element of such a program would be an adequate crew of temporary summer workers to administer the sale, and the cutting, patrolling, signing, and cleanup elements of the program.

Such a program would benefit wildlife and livestock grazing by providing opportunities for better forage diversity.

Fence posts should also be sold under this program.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Livestock Grazing 2.5 and Wildlife 1.31.)

The demand for timber products in Clark County has increased steadily over the past few years and is expected to continue to do so in light of this observed trend and economic indications (PAA). There exist a few isolated woodland areas in Clark County of which the Spring Mountains dominate in size and popularity as a recreation area. Although numerous species of trees exist in the area, only pinyon pine and juniper exist in abundance and are not protected by the State. Such species as Douglas fir, and ponderosa and bristlecone pines are considered rare and unique here and are being recommended for ACEC classification (Forestry 2.1).

Numerous methods exist for manipulating the vegetation resource to the benefit of other resource values. Recommendations for prescribed burning programs and chaining and seeding are covered under Forestry 3.1 and 3.2 and Wild Horses and Burros 2.1 and 2.2. Another method of managing the vegetation resource is through a greenwood cutting program. This method of resource management would enable the Bureau to meet increasing public demand for firewood and posts while providing a tool by which other resources might benefit.

(Forestry 1.1 continued)

Where recreation is recognized as the overriding resource value, as is the case in the Spring Mountains (Recreation 5.1), care must be taken to coordinate carefully with the recreation staff any action taken in this area. In areas designated as WSAs, the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review must be adhered to (Recreation 7.1).

The benefits derived from a greenwood cutting program would be realized by many resources. Designation of greenwood cutting areas on slopes of 30% or less would greatly benefit the forage resource for livestock grazing on allotments within the Spring Mountain Range area by releasing the vegetation from dense overstories in otherwise accessible terrain. At present, only the Wheeler Wash allotment is actively being grazed on the west side of the Spring Mountains, this being the side recommended for cutting.

In order to increase the diversity of wildlife in the Spring Mountains, greenwood cutting of monotypic pinyon and juniper stands could be carried out. The diversity of wildlife habitat in the area depends to a great extent on vegetation manipulation in order to set back the trend towards climax. In an area which has been protected over the years, that by cutting selected stands of timber would benefit both wildlife and the public in terms of improved hunting. This type of program is also recommended for the McCullough and Virgin Mountain ranges (Wildlife   ) and will be looked into in the future, funding and manpower permitting for the development of a HMP prior to cutting.

The administration of a greenwood cutting program should be carried out by Bureau personnel for numerous reasons. By opening up cutting areas in the summer months of June through August, seasonal personnel are more readily available for use supervision. Resource values can best be maintained by following the cut with fall seeding, an optimum time for spring regrowth. The public can feasibly retrieve wood, although this is an uncomfortably hot time of the year for outside activity. This would help to alleviate the pressures caused by unrestricted use, e.g., vehicles in the recreation area, especially where fragile watershed values are of concern (Watershed 4.3). In addition, normal collection of dead and down timber would continue to be available during other months of the year.

Multiple Use Recommendation:	Reasons:
Develop a greenwood cutting program in pinyon and juniper areas in the Spring, Virgin, and McCullough Mountain Ranges, with priority for the Spring Mountains. Cutting areas should be identified through activity planning and serve multiple use purposes. Wood cuts should be supervised by Bureau personnel and be accomplished during the summer months when temporary help is most available. All cutting plans on the Spring Mountain	Multiple use benefits to recreationists, livestock, wildlife, and the public can be realized through this recommendation.

(Forestry 1.1 Continued)

Range must be coordinated with, and subordinated to, recreation plans for that area. Reseeding of a cut area will take place the autumn following the cut.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative considered:
Allow no greenwood cutting.

Recommendation 1.2:
Design and implement a system by which lands identified as suitable may be leased to local nurserymen to produce desert vegetation and/or drought-resistant and low-water-requirement vegetation.

Support Needs:
Lands program, vegetation and soils specialists.

Rationale:
Although the Las Vegas Valley currently has adequate water supplies, primarily from Colorado River water allocations, continued future growth will reduce that margin of supply to critical levels. Las Vegas currently has one of the highest per capita rates of water consumption. One reason for this is the copious amounts needed to keep lawns green during hot summer months. As future water supply margins shrink, greater emphasis will be placed on water-conserving desert landscaping. To avoid ruinous vegetation trespass, BLM should cooperate now to develop inexpensive sources of these plants.

See Lands 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.3:

Prior to initiation of rights-of-way development, mining actions, or other activities which would destroy desert or woodland vegetation, take place, the area should be opened to the public to remove vegetation that would otherwise be destroyed.

Support Needs:

Lands and Minerals programs; advertising.

Rational:

There is a demand for desert vegetation which is sometimes satisfied by illegal harvesting or from out-of-state sources. By providing a mechanism within the Bureau for disposal of desert vegetation, the Bureau could partially fulfill the present demand and channel the impact to appropriate areas.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Watershed 1.1)

Numerous requests for the acquisition of native desert vegetation and timber have been received and are expected to be forth-coming. Bureau policy allows for the disposition of vegetation products by either sale or free use (CFR 5400, 5500). The salvation of materials for landscaping, research, firewood, and construction materials is viable. In addition to aesthetic values derived from landscaping, transplanting of native vegetation has been identified as an ecological benefit to watershed on private lands (WS 1.1). Free use permits could be issued for removal of vegetation other than for commercial purposes, in cases where the vegetation would otherwise be destroyed from both desert lands and timbered areas. Sale of salvageable materials would generate revenues for the Bureau while offering an alternative source of materials to commercial interests.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept as written. Coordinate the removal of native desert vegetation (yuccas and cacti) with the Nevada Division of Forestry. Develop an advertising program whereby the developer or the Bureau has the responsibility for making the public aware of upcoming sales or give-aways.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Reasons:

The salvation of vegetation materials by the public would enable the Bureau to administer a growing demand for these products while generating revenue for the Bureau in some cases.

Alternatives Considered:

None

Objective 2.0:
Protect, preserve, and regenerate the ecological niches of Douglas Fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), Ponderosa Pine (Pinus ponderosa), Bristlecone Pine (Pinus artista), and other rare or unique plant communities.

Rationale:
The topography and climate of the Clark County area have resulted in the isolated development of some plant communities. In some cases, geographic evolvement has left remnant populations of plants which, today in Clark County, are far removed from their normal range or distribution. Therefore, hybrids of these species have developed that are unique to the area. It is recommended that these "pockets" be preserved for their uniqueness, for future study by the academic community, and as a seed source.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective embodies an important protective concern for management of such relic stands of trees. It is consistent with guidance in FLPMA (Sec. 102 (a) (8)).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:
Designate areas of Douglas Fir, Ponderosa Pine, Bristlecone Pine, and other unique plant communities as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Removal of any individual trees or plants would be justifiable only as a means of protection of these species, i.e., removal of diseased or insect-infested trees.

Support Needs:
Federal Register Notice.

Rationale:
The rarity of the occurrence of *Pseudotsuga menziesii* and *Pinus ponderosa* stands in Southern Nevada warrants the preservation of these stands. An ACEC designation would provide the necessary management guidance to give the proper level of protection.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Wildlife 1.37 and Cultural Resources 1.6)

An "Area of Critical Environmental Concern" (ACEC) is defined as an area within the public lands where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to a specific resource value, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards (Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Policy and Procedures Guidelines, USDI, BLM, June, 1980, Sec. 103 (a)). Numerous areas within Clark County have been identified for nomination as an ACEC, the basis of which is for the protection of a natural resource. Included are:

Area	Reason for Identification As An ACEC	Recommendation
To include stands of Douglas Fir, Ponderosa Pine, Bristlecone Pine, and other unique plant communities	Rarity of occurrence. Stands of unique timber species exist in the higher altitudes of the Virgin, Spring, and lesser mtn. ranges. Unique cacti communities exist in various areas throughout Clark County - (URA 3, 4)	Forestry 2.1

(Forestry 2.1 continued)

Virgin River	Unique as a riparian zone, this area has been identified as critical habitat for the Woundfin, an endangered fish species (Federal). Concerned groups include local, State, & Federal agencies (PAA).	Wildlife 2.2
Areas of Bighorn summer habitat, lambing habitat, and migration routes (listed by priority) in the following ranges: Arrow Canyon McCullough Mtns. Highland Range Red Rock/LaMadre Muddy Mtns. Bird Spring Eldorado Virgin Mtns. New York/Castle/Piute	To safeguard and perpetuate this species and its habitat.	Wildlife 1.37
Areas of desert tortoise crucial habitat included in the following: Piute Valley Goodsprings Moapa Arrow Canyon California Wash	To protect and intensively manage desert tortoise populations. Concern for this species is at least regional and may be national (PAA).	Wildlife 3.7
High probability areas for archeological finds (see MFP 3 overlay for locations).	High potential for fragile archeological resources.	Cultural Resources 1.6
Old Spanish Trail	Historical values and preservation.	Cultural Resources 1.6

(Forestry 2.1 continued)

There are a number of activities which could conflict with the resources noted in these recommendations. All would be surface disturbing activities: mineral operations, construction, off-road vehicle use, utility rights-of-way, etc. The nominated areas have resource values of apparent high value that warrant protection. Whether the ACEC designation is appropriate can only be determined through the ACEC identification and designation process. It is policy within the State of Nevada that resources that can be adequately managed and protected through existing devices, such as activity or management planning, should not be considered under the ACEC process.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows: Accept the listed areas as nominees for the ACEC identification and designation process except for the wildlife habitat areas (bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitats and the Virgin River Critical habitat of the woundfin). Undertake the process with priority to relic stands of trees, cultural resource sites.

Reason:

The areas nominated, from a variety of different sources, should be examined to determine if ACEC designation is needed for resource protection. The bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitats can be adequately managed through HMPs and the "Section 7" consultation provides special emphasis for endangered species.

Support Needs:

All activities, funding of ACEC process.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Do not nominate.
2. Evaluate as Natural Areas.

Recommendation 2.2:
Develop an interpretive signing program to explain why unique plant communities (Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, bristlecone pine, etc.) require protection.

Support Needs:
Interpretive Specialists, Public Affairs.

Rationale:
The remoteness of the unique communities makes constant patrol impractical. A sign program would serve the purpose of a constant reminder to would-be cutters of the need to preserve the selected stands and the reasons why.

Multiple Use Analysis

No conflicts were identified with this recommendation. It is complemented by Recreation 1.4, which urges protection of several desert vegetation sites. Forestry 2.1 also calls for these areas to be considered as ACECs. Signs, on the other hand, could be undesirable marks of man in areas which are esentially natural.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: Determine the need for interpretive signing programs during ACEC consideration.

Support Needs:
ACEC Process.

Reason:
Interpretive signing is one of many protective actions available. The full range of protection ought to be considered before making a commitment to one or another.

Alternative Considered:
Proceed with the recommendation.

Recommendation 2.3:
Develop and implement, by FY84, a priority system by which wildfires shall be suppressed in all areas containing Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, and bristlecone pine.

Support Needs:
Fire Management Officer.

Rationale:
Priority of fire suppression may be given to the fire of the largest size. Unfortunately, this could result in a 50-acre fire in a pinyon-juniper stand taking precedence over a 5-acre fire in a bristlecone pine stand. The relative value should be higher on the bristlecone pine because of the uniqueness of this species, than on that of rather commonly occuring pinyon-juniper stands.

See Fire 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.4:

Develop and implement, by FY87, a prescribed burning program for the purpose of slash reduction and/or regeneration enhancement of species such as Douglas fir.

Support Needs:

Fire Management Officer; Wildlife and Range Specialists; Fire Crew.

Rationale:

The relatively low cost of burning allows for an inexpensive way of regenerating and/or reducing the fire hazard in woodland stands by removing vegetation debris and small shrubs in a forest or woodland understory. Otherwise, this material could encourage wildfire spread, doing extensive damage to such relic stands.

In addition, Douglas fir requires fire to scarify its seeds, burn off humus layer in the soil, and perform other functions relevant to its reproductive cycle. Prescribed burns would thus aid the density of these stands.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 3.0:
Use fire as a major management tool to accomplish vegetation manipulation to improve woodland quality on public lands in Clark County.

Rationale:
Fire is a natural part of the ecology and, in areas where other resource values or private property are not at risk, it provides an extremely cost-effective management tool. Many vegetation communities, in fact, require periodic fire as an aid to maintaining or increasing their vitality. Fire-caused vegetation manipulation can also provide great benefits to wildlife habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation reflects incorporation of natural processes into management actions to achieve multiple-use resource objectives. While it is supported by Bureau policy as a cost-effective management tool, concern remains high for the safe and reasonable use of fire.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written with the addition of the following sentence: "Assure that, at a maximum, chances for a controlled fire to become a wildfire are very low."

Recommendation 3.1:
Identify areas on the Spring Mountain Range where pinyon-juniper stands can be effectively manipulated by prescribed burning to improve multiple use resource values.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Fire Management Officer, Wildlife and Livestock Management.

Rationale:
Pinyon pine and juniper on the Spring Mountain Range has been intensively protected from fire in recent times. This has resulted in trends toward pure stands of these species which is not conducive to other ecological elements, such as wildlife.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.2:
The policy of opening an area to cutting at least two years before any prescribed burning treatments are administered should be strictly adhered to.

Support Needs:
Division of Administration, Public Affairs, Forestry Patrols.

Rationale:
With the current demand for firewood, proper management by the Bureau could reduce the present expenditure for vegetation manipulation. This would result in a net savings for the Bureau.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.3:
By FY84, develop and implement a public education program which will emphasize the resource benefits of prescribed burning.

Support Needs:
Public Affairs.

Rationale:
The "Smokey Bear" program has been extraordinarily successful in convincing the public of the evils of wildfire. That attitude carries over to prescribed burns and could be an obstacle to such programs. A public education program would be helpful in dispelling some of that hostility.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.4:
Develop by FY85 a programmatic plan for fire rehabilitation on public lands throughout Clark County with priority for the Spring Mountain Range and the South McCullough Range.

Support Needs:
All programs.

Rationale:
A programmatic plan would insure rapid rehabilitation action on fire-caused vegetation damage, particularly in th priority areas. This could prevent subsequent significant damage to such values as forestry, watershed, VRM, recreation, and wildlife habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Forestry 3.5, Fire 1.10, and Watershed 4.1 and 4.3)

Numerous resource values are at stake once a fire burns through an area. Emergency fire funds (4630) are available for rehabilitation on lands damaged by fire. In order to best utilize these funds and to expedite the rehabilitation process in trying to prevent significant damage to resource values, i.e., watershed (Watershed 4.1), visual, recreation, and wildlife habitat (Forestry 3.4), a comprehensive plan should be developed.

A programmatic Environmental Assessment Record (EAR) could be used for reference and guidelines in the development of a general fire rehabilitation plan in Clark County. Special consideration should be given to rehabilitation in the Spring and Southern McCullough Mountain Ranges (Forestry 3.4). A contractual agreement with the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) would guarantee that nursery stock for planting be made immediately available following a fire (Forestry 3.5). A memo EA would be required to analyze site-specific impacts and to recommend mitigation on a specific fire-damaged area.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendations as written. Conclude the contractual agreement with NDF by FY85 to coincide with completion of the programmatic rehabilitation plan.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason
By following this recommendation, fire rehabilitation procedures will be expedited and post-fire damage to resources will be minimized.

Alternative Considered:
None

Recommendation 3.5:
Enter into a contractual agreement with the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) to obtain nursery stock to be used in the rehabilitation of areas which are destroyed or altered by fire.

Support Needs:
Division of Administration, NSO Contract Officer.

Rationale:
The fire rehabilitation manual allows for the use of fire funds for the rehabilitation of fire damaged areas where deemed feasible and necessary. This requires that planting stock be immediately available. The Bureau has neither the personnel nor the budget with which to operate a nursery. Presently, the Nevada Division of Forestry does operate a nursery in the Las Vegas vicinity. A contract in which the Bureau would buy planting stock from NDF would allow for immediate rehabilitation of areas which would otherwise have to rehabilitate naturally, sometimes with an invading species, or no regeneration at all.

See Forestry 3.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 1.0:
Prevent degradation of natural resources and destruction of structural improvements, both on public lands and on private lands adjacent to public lands, by suppressing wildfires on public lands.

Rationale:
Currently, 60 to 70 wildfires (unplanned fires) occur on public lands each year. These consume 150 to 1,700 acres per year. By major causes, 29% of wildfires have been started by lightning and 71% man-related.

The use of public lands by the large Southern Nevada population dictates a high value-at-risk classification on many areas of public lands within Clark County. Hot, dry temperatures characteristic of the desert environment lure many people to the high, mountainous areas, where cooler temperatures and unique vegetation provide scenic and recreational activity.

Wildfires can leave public lands and enter adjacent private property, threatening, among other things, valuable structures. The urban-wildland interface problem occurs throughout Clark County and is spreading rapidly. Population growth and the associated structures are occurring throughout the Spring Mountain Range. Examples are found in Mountain Springs, Lovell Canyon, and Trout Canyon.

Wildfires would be engaged on private lands only if there were a clear and immediate danger of the fire spreading to public lands.

Unique vegetation types are found throughout Clark County. Species which are common in other areas are unique to this desert area. These vegetation types range from pinyon-juniper to ponderosa pine. The common desert species found in Clark County play an important role as habitat for wildlife and in maintaining good watershed conditions. Loss of this habitat and ground cover, particularly when climatic conditions indicate slow natural recovery, can have severe negative effects on the land's productivity.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is consistent with Bureau policy.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:
Develop an effective fire prevention and presuppression program. Place prevention signs on all major access roads.

Consider the following elements:
A.) Develop a fire prevention sign plan which would include a catalog of all available fire prevention signs and sites where these signs are to be placed within Clark County.

B.) Develop fire prevention display for the Red Rock Visitor Center. Work cooperatively with the Red Rock Visitor Center interpretive staff, to develop a display and a slide-tape presentation concerning fire prevention.

C.) Establish a fire prevention contact reference guide involving newspapers, radio stations, television stations, exhibitions, fairs, and other media outlets, for the purposes of promoting fire prevention and the fire program.

Support Needs:
Nevada State Office, Branch Fire Management; all interagency cooperators; all Las Vegas District Division Chiefs and Resource Area Managers.

Rationale:
Man-caused fires account for 71% of the fire workload in Clark County. This tends to force the fire program into a "react posture." By reducing the number and size of man-caused fires, the fire program can more efficiently support management activities.

Multiple Use Analysis

A majority of the fire workload in Clark County results from the careless actions of people. This problem will grow with the increase in population and recreation on BLM managed lands. Fire prevention and presuppression are key elements in BLM's continuing effort to reduce and control fires. The savings from fire prevention can be substantial and would allow the use of

(Fire 1.1 continued)

firefighting resources in other areas. The need to develop and implement a fire prevention and presuppression program to protect BLM resources, especially recreation activities, is supported by Forestry 2.1, and Recreation 1.6, 4.5, and 5.1. The Mack Canyon Fire, 1981, is an example of a man-caused fire that could have been prevented with substantial savings to BLM.

Multiple Use Recommendation:	Reason:
Accept the recommendation as written.	This action is good management. It can decrease loss from fire for both private and government sectors. The projected savings is substantial.
Support Needs:	**Alternative Considered:**
As stated in MFP 1.	None

Recommendation 1.2:

Develop a comprehensive fire pre-attack plan by FY83 for Clark County, incorporating information as described in the Clark County URA -Fire Management .37.
The following units need to be pre-attack inventoried by priority, according to the Spring Mountain Interagency Agreement. Those areas with an asterisk have urban/wildland interface problems.

1. E-3 LaMadre
2. E-5 Deer Creek*
3. E-6 Lucky Strike Canyon
4. E-10 Wallace Canyon*
5. E-11 Mt. Stirling
6. E-12 Trout Canyon*
7. E-15 Bird Springs
8. E-16 Table Mountain*
9. E-17 Pahrump Valley*
10. V-1 McCullough Range
11. V-3 Laughlin*
12. V-4 Searchlight*
13. V-5 Nelson*
14. V-6 Boulder City*
15. V-7 Frenchman Mountains*
16. V-10 Virgin Mountains*
17. V-9 North Muddy Mountains
18. V-2 Piute Malley
19. V-8 Muddy Mountains
20. M-1 Mormon Mountains
21. M-2 Meadow Valley Mountains
22. M-3 Arrow Canyon Range
23. T-1 Tonopah Highway Roadside*

Support Needs:

Nevada State Office, Branch Fire Management; District Office, Division of Operations, Division of Resources, Resource Area Specialists, Fire Management Section.

Rationale:

The pre-attack system would incorporate all factors that are important to effectively dispatch a predetermined, appropriate, and effective allocation of manpower and equipment to a reported fire, based on known and documented values-at-risk. The system can justify sending less units to a fire area with low values-at-risk or to an area with low spread potential, such as a dry lake area. Conversely, the system would cause more manpower and equipment to be dispatched to a high value-at-risk area.

The pre-attack planning system encourages the most cost-effective allocation of manpower and equipment to a reported fire, based on known and documented values-at-risk.

(Fire 1.2 continued)

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 4.2)

The key to a timely and effective response to a wildfire is a pre-attack plan. It must identify the values-at-risk and other critical resource issues (see Fire 1.4 and 1.6, Recreation 4.5, 5.1, and 7.1, Cultural Resources 1.7, Lands 3.2, and Watershed 4.2). It must delineate the suppression techniques and equipment that will address the sensitive needs of the site. It must be accessible to the Fire Boss, Resource Manager, and others from the onset of the fire to its complete suppression. An adequate initial attack can prevent both the spread of fire and unnecessary resource damage.

Multiple Use Recommendation:	Reason:
Accept the recommendation as written.	This meets the goals and objectives of public land management for maximal benefit and the prevention of loss and unnecessary expense.
Support Needs:	**Alternative Considered:**
As stated in MFP 1.	None

Recommendation 1.3:
Develop a Fire Detection Plan for Clark County by FY83 that includes aerial reconnaissance flight patterns, a directory of cooperative fire detection agencies, a directory of available reconnaissance aircraft, and a procedural guide to the implementation of the detection forces.

Support Needs:
All local fire cooperators, Nevada State Office, all District personnel.

Rationale:
To effectively reduce District detection costs by establishing a system of cooperators throughout the planning unit, a detection plan is needed. It would also allow rapid deployment of closest suppression forces.

Multiple Use Analysis

One of the most effective aids to fire suppression is early detection. A Fire Detection Plan that identifies fires while they are small and have potential for minimal damage is a very effective system for reducing costs to BLM and all resources. An effective system will benefit everyone.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
This meets the goals and objectives of public land management and resource protection.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None

Recommendation 1.4:
Develop, within two years following the MFP-3 decision, a Fire Management Plan that incorporates all pertinent decisions and recommendations from adjoining fire management plans. Update the Values-at-Risk Overlay in order to include this information into the pre-attack plans, particularly so as to justify prepositioning equipment in key areas.

Priority should be given to:
1. Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands
2. Spring Mountain Range

Support Needs:
All District resource program activities.

Rationale:
The Bureau planning system identifies the resource values (value-at-risk) by activity and area of concern. These same values and concerns should be reflected in the fire management program.

Many of the actions that the fire program may take have the potential to either enhance or destroy the resource values.

The fire management program must support and be supported by the resource planning recommendations.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Forestry 2.3, Fire 1.6, Recreation 4.5, and Cultural Resources 1.7)

A Fire Management Plan would incorporate all the fire management plans (see Fire 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3). The fire prevention and presuppression plan (Fire 1.1) will minimize the number of wildfires by reducing the man-caused fires. The Fire Pre-Attack Plan (Fire 1.2) will identify the manpower and staff for initial attack, to insure the efficient suppression of the fire. Effective reaction by the fire crew will prevent the spread and enlargement of the fire. The Fire Detection Plan (Fire 1.3) will provide prior warning and an early detection system to facilitate the suppression of a fire before it becomes a major problem. The Fire Management Plan will address the needs, concerns, and limitations on a site-by-site basis. Some sites will be identified as high priority because of the value-at-risk. These sites have high property values such as communication facilities (Lands 3.2), areas containing Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, and bristlecone pine (Forestry 2.3), historical and archeological sites (Cultural Resources 1.7), prime recreational areas (Recreation 4.5 and 5.1), and areas with urban/wildlife interface. They need special planning and immediate action in the event of fire to prevent its spread. Other areas have unique features or resources that require special suppression techniques, such as historical and archeological sites (Recreation 7.1 and Cultural Resources 1.7), and recreational sites (Recreation 5.1). These sites may require the use of non-mechanized or specialized fire suppression techniques and equipment to prevent unnecessary damage to the resource. (The PAA identifies the Spring Mountains and the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands as areas having high recreation values and usage, including

(Fire 1.4 continued)

some private and State property.) The development of homes and facilities in urban-wildland interface areas requires immediate suppression to minimize loss of life and property. These modifications of the Pre-Attack Plan (Fire 1.2) and utilization of equipment (Fire 1.6) will be source and reference documents to the fire boss, resource advisor, and others when a wildfire is discovered. Other areas will be identified where fire may benefit the range user as a means of vegetation manipulation (Fire 2.1, Livestock 1.10, Wild Horse and Burro 2.1, and Wildlife 1.3). The identification and mapping of all critical concerns will provide the basis for prepositioning equipment and personnel in key areas. The Fire Management Plan will address all conflicts and needs on a site-by-site basis and the techniques and equipment that will be utilized.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Develop, by FY85, a fire management plan to combat wildland fires on public lands in Clark County. Suppression priorities are as follows:

1. Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands
2. Mountain Springs/Mt. Potosi Area
3. Kyle Canyon
4. Lee Canyon
5. Remaining Spring Mountain Range with priority to recreation areas 6. Other areas of urban-wildland interface
7. Virgin Mountains - relic stands of trees
8. South McCullough Mountains-unique vegetation areas

Provide fire protection to the following historical properties, either in conjunction with areas listed above, if they are located there, or otherwise as priority 9: Mt. Potosi Cabin, Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns, Searchlight Mining District, Virgin Mtn. Cabin, Goodsprings Mining District, Mt. Potosi Mines, Trout Canyon Cabin, South McCullough Wickiup, Crescent Peak Mining District.

Use of fire suppression equipment and techniques to their maximum design capabilities will be modified as necessary to assure no greater damage occurs to resource values from the suppression effort than could occur from the fire. On all fires in the priority areas, a resource advisor will be requested and assigned.

Reason:

A prepared management plan will enhance fire suppression efforts, and consequently reduce loss of property and resource values. Resource advisors are key persons on the fire suppression staff to assure the effort is cost-effective and important resource values are protected.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:

None

One side
only
Please

Recommendation 1.5:
Improve legal access into areas of high fire occurrence and/or high resource values. Arrange for easements where needed or access across private property. Maintain key BLM roads by annual grading in the following priority:
A.) Wheeler Pass Road
B.) Lovell Canyon Road
C.) Highway 88 (Old Pahrump Highway)
D.) Red Rock Summit Road (Willow Springs to Lovell Canyon Road)

Support Needs:
Local, city, county, regional, State, and Federal cooperators. District Division of Operations, Division of Resources, Planning & Environmental Coordination Staff, Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands Staff.

Rationale:
Through an improved road system, fire equipment can be utilized to its maximum capability by reducing travel time to the scene of the fire incident and by increasing its accessibility into the area, thus reducing suppression cost and reducing the potential need for more manpower and equipment.

Multiple Use Analysis

The only conflict with this recommendation comes from a Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands (RRCRL) master plan item to close the Red Rock Summit Road to vehicular travel (Recreation 1.6). The plan did not, apparently, consider initial attack in wildland fires. Use of the Summit Road (also known as Potato Ridge Road) would significantly quicken response time of fire equipment to Lovell and Trout Canyons. In both places, as well as the western side of RRCRL, there are high resource values-at-risk. In Lovell Canyon there is significant urban-wildland interface.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Reason:
Firefighting has a high priority in this area of the Spring Mountain Range. Response time to wildfires ought to be as rapid as possible to minimize resource loss.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Maintain all roads except the Red Rock Summit Road for fire access.

Recommendation 1.6:
Utilize fire suppression equipment and techniques to their maximum design capabilities as identified in Table 37.3 of Clark County URA, Fire Management.

Support Needs:
District Resource Specialists, District Division of Operations, Fire Management Officer, and Fire Engine Operators.

Rationale:
By operating equipment at the maximum level, the cost-per-unit of work performed is minimized. Also, wildfire is quickly suppressed. By operating equipment in this manner both the cost of the actual fire suppression and the cost of the resource damage by fire are kept to the minimum. By maintaining fire equipment in a constant state of fire readiness overall fire suppression response, cost, and damage can be kept to a minimum.

Due to increasing complexity of fire equipment, i.e., pump operation, apparatus operation, and code driving, maintain a highly trained and experienced cadre that will be available to operate fire equipment to its maximum capabilities.

See Fire 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.7:
Update all fire-related cooperative agreements on an annual basis.

Support Needs:
Nevada State Office, Branch Fire Management. Local, city, county, regional, State, and Federal cooperators. District Division of Operations.

Rationale:
The time between a fire start and initial attack can easily influence the extent of damage to resource values.

The maintenance and continuity of the cooperative agreements are important because, a) the agreements are a part of the fire management program planning process, b) the amount of public investment in personnel and equipment is influenced by the agreements, c) the positioning or disposition of personnel and equipment is influenced by the agreements, and d) the agreements must be consistent with Bureau and District policy and program activities.

The agreements currently in effect are delineated in the Clark County Planning Area Analysis.

Multiple Use Analysis

The interface of BLM administered lands with other lands administered by various Federal, State, and local agencies requires the maximum cooperation and communication between entities to expediently and efficiently operate a Fire Management Plan. Annual review and communication through cooperative agreement will support BLM fire management planning. New techniques, equipment, funding levels, and available trained staff require periodic review and interagency coordination.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
This action meets the management objective of maximizing the use of available resources to prevent and suppress fire and to reduce costs.

Alternative Considered:
None

Recommendation 1.8:
Work closely with the Clark County Coordinator of the office of Volunteer Fire Departments, to achieve cooperation in training, prevention, detection, initial attack, use of facilities, and exchange of fire equipment.

Support Needs:
Nevada State Office, Office of Fire and Aviation Clark County, Office of Volunteer Fire Departments, Local Volunteer Fire Departments; District Division of Administration.

Rationale:
The volunteer fire departments play a key role in the protection of the public lands. The stations are located in remote areas relative to the location of BLM equipment. They are usually the first to arrive at a fire in their protection area. Public lands occur in a protection area. A need exists for standardization of equipment, effective communication, and complementary detection and reporting procedures.

Multiple Use Analysis

In many instances, volunteer fire departments will respond to a wildland fire much quicker than the nearest BLM crew. The ability to reduce fire damage to BLM resources warrants cooperation with local entities. Most volunteer departments need training in the techniques and equipment utilized by BLM.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
This coincides with the management goal to minimize fire losses and costs.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.9:
Develop and implement by FY83 an aggressive District program for investigating fire trespasses.

Support Needs:
Nevada State Office, Branch Fire Management. District, all divisions, all cooperators, law enforcement investigators.

Rationale:
Investigation of fire trespass can accomplish two goals. First, it offers a possible deterrent to potential future arson. Secondly, the Bureau of Land Management can retrieve suppression cost in the case of a proven fire trespass.

Multiple Use Analysis

The need to implement a deterrent to the high rate of man-caused fires is present in Clark County. A secondary benefit could be the recovery of some or all of the money expended to suppress a wildfire. The Mack Canyon Fire of 1981 is a prime example of a man-caused fire that could be used as a deterrent.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
This action will strengthen and support the Fire Management Program. It also will increase BLM efficiency of operation.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.10:
Develop a programmatic fire rehabilitation plan for Clark County within two years of the MFP-3 decisions.

Support Needs:
NSO Division of Resources, District Division of Resources, and District Planning and Environmental Coordination Staff.

Rationale:
The following procedures are required in order to utilize emergency fire rehabilitation funds (4630). Starting from control of the fire the following must be completed:

a) Within 10 days- Examine burned area to determine need for rehabilitation.
b) Within 30 days- Initiate job planning and project design.
c) Within 90 days- Initiate actual on-the-ground rehabilitation work.

The preparation of a programmatic EAR containing standard rehabilitation procedures would expedite this required process. Following a fire, a supplemental (site-specific) EAR should be prepared for rehabilitation projects.

See Forestry 3.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 2.0:
Use fire as a management tool to enhance conditions of renewable resources or meet management objectives for a site.

Rationale:
Fire can perform multiple functions when properly applied with both the objective and related beneficial results being achieved. The following areas can benefit from the use of prescribed fire and natural fire management.

Fire Prevention: Controlled burning to remove highly flammable fuel types can reduce fire spread and break up fuel continuity.
Range Management: Prescribed fires can improve the availability and nutritive value of forage plants, and also control unwanted woody invaders, such as sagebrush, burroweed, and junipers.
Wildlife Habitat: Wildlife habitat can be improved by the planned use of fire. Many plants used as wildlife forage are prolific sprouters after fire. Natural cover for wildlife can also be manipulated and improved to manage certain species.
Wilderness Areas: Natural prescribed fire can perpetuate natural conditions in wilderness areas.
Forest Protection: Prescribed fire can reduce ladder fuels, reducing overall fire hazard to a forest, and improve seed bed site conditions for many tree species.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective recognizes fire's natural place in the ecology and the benefits -- in resource management and economics -- available through its use as a management tool. It is in conformance with a growing Bureau policy towards fire management.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:

Use fire as a natural tool to achieve resource management goals, through both prescribed burning and modified suppression of wildfires.

Support Needs:

All Resource Specialists, Fire Management Officer, Resource Advisors.

Rationale:

Fire is a cost-effective method when used in resource management. It can be used either alone or in combination with other management methods.

Fuel reduction, species change, stimulating or setting back growth of specific plant species, and water production are practical objectives that can be reached through the use of fire.

A complete fire management program that is based upon and integrated with the Bureau planning system will become a useful adjunct to the present resource management programs.

Prescribed burn areas should be identified through activity planning for specific resources. Burn locations, size, and objectives should be identified then.

Modified suppression areas should be identified on a larger area planning effort, the fire management plan.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Forestry 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, Livestock Grazing 1.10, Wild Horses and Burros 2.1, and Wildlife 1.30)

Utilizing fire as a tool in natural resource management is a relatively new concept in the Las Vegas District. Both prescribed burning and modified suppression of wildfires can be beneficial when managing for specific resource values in multiple use management. A fire management program which would integrate these concepts would be useful.

To best benefit big game in mountain vegetation types, modified suppression of wildfire would effectively reverse trends towards vegetative climax, thus providing preferred use areas for these wildlife species. Increased habitat diversity could also be realized (Wildlife 1.30, Forestry 3.1).

(Fire 2.1 continued)

Prescribed burning and modified suppression of wildfires can be used economically to remove undesirable vegetation, to the benefit of livestock, wild horses and burros, and selected wildlife species. Fire not only reduces competition between desirable and undesirable plant species, allowing the former to come back in on a fresh burn, but also establishes a range condition suitable for introduction of desirable plant seeds (Livestock Grazing 1.10, Wild Horses and Burros 2.1).

Watershed and timber values can be greatly improved through the use of fire. Wildfire presents a potential hazard to relic stands of timber unique to mountain areas of Clark County due to an accumulation of dense understory vegetation. Prescribed burning can be used to selectively remove these understory materials, subsequently reducing hazards (Forestry 2.4). Some species, such as Douglas fir, depend exclusively on fire to release their seeds for regeneration (Forestry 2.4). Mechanical treatments, incorporating fire, on watershed areas can greatly reduce damage caused by flooding while increasing such values as ground infiltration (Watershed 4.7).

Benefits derived from a prescribed burn and modified suppression program are far-reaching beyond the direct resource improvements expected from such a program.

In the Spring Mountains, where the recreational resource will command priority over management of other resources (Recreation 5.1), the threat of wildfire to campgrounds, structures, and recreationists would be reduced through a fire management program. Any action taken in this area would be done in coordination and with the cooperation of the recreation program.

In addition, the Spring Mountain Range has many high value-at-risk areas and a great deal of urban-wildland interface (Fire 1 2, 1.4). Modified suppression of wildland fires in that area would probably generate a great deal of negative public reaction (PAA).

In timbered areas where the preservation of relic tree species is not a priority, the wood can be salvaged by the public prior to a prescribed burn.

It is important that the Bureau make every effort to educate the public on the merits and possible adverse consequences of prescribed burning and suppression goals. In the past, the Bureau's program to alert the public as to the adversity of wildfire has been successful, but further attempts should be made to educate these same people as to the benefits which can also be derived from fire when used in a controlled setting as a management tool.

(Fire 2.1 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: Develop a county-wide program to utilize prescribed burning and modified suppression of wildfires as a vegetation manipulation tool. Vegetation manipulation areas must be identified through activity plans (AMP, HMP, HMAP, etc.) and must serve multiple-use objectives. The first manipulation area should be identified in FY83, for implementation during FY85, so as to allow two years for the sale of firewood and other products on the burn site. Greenwood cutting should precede all prescribed burns. After FY85, target should be a minimum of one prescribed burn per year. Prescription for a burn/modified suppression site should be developed within one year after site identification. Sites with relatively rare tree species, (e.g., ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, bristlecone pine, etc.), may be selected for prescribed burning to remove undergrowth and aid regeneration, but extreme care must be taken to avoid damage or destruction of the key tree species. Complete such prescribed burn plans by FY87. Modified suppression plans should be closely coordinated county-wide with adjacent landowners and firefighting agencies. No modified suppression of wildland fires will be used in the Spring Mountain Range. Prescribed burning in the Spring Mountain Range must be closely coordinated with, and subordinated to, recreation plans. Develop, and implement during FY84, a public education program explaining the purposes, ecological benefits, and economics of fire as a resource management tool.

Reason:
Prescribed burning is a proven, cost-effective method of vegetation manipulation to serve multiple use management objectives. Modified suppression can be used in lieu of a total suppression effort in those areas where pre-planned, management objectives can be obtained and danger to life or private property is non-existent. As a primary recreation area, prescribed burning plans in the Spring Mountains must be subordinated to recreation plans. Moreover, the high values-at-risk and the urban-wildland interface preclude any reasonable and safe use of modified suppression in that mountain range.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Allow no prescribed burning in the Spring Mountain Range.
2. Use no fire District-wide as a management tool.

Recommendation 2.2:
Develop a prescribed fire workshop program to include the most recent concepts and developments in the area of fire management and prescribed fire techniques, for all District personnel. This program should precede development of proposed prescribed burn areas.

Support Needs:
Nevada State Office, all branches;
District Office, all divisions.

Rationale:
By establishing a program for District personnel concerning techniques in prescribed fire, District personnel will be more adequately equipped to understand program, support, and work on prescribed fire projects.

Multiple Use Analysis

Fire as a management tool, as a natural part of the ecology, is a relatively unknown factor to resource specialists and managers. Yet it offers an excellent cost-effective means of reaching certain management objectives. A workshop such as this would provide the guidance needed to work the program into the management scheme at all levels.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
Such a program would be an excellent learning experience.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None

Objective 1.0:
Provide public land resources in Clark County to aid in reducing consumption and the deterioration of quality of groundwater supplies brought on through urban usage.

Rationale:
Continued per capita consumption of water in Clark County will result in future shortages, assuming continued population growth. While the BLM cannot meet the water needs of Southern Nevada, it can encourage the conservation of existing supplies.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective serves overall public purposes in Southern Nevada. It should be understood that it is not a primary responsibility of BLM to foster the goals of this objective, but that BLM should stand ready to respond constructively to local requests for support in achieving these desirable goals. In this light, the objective is consistent with "good neighbor" and "public service" concepts recently enunciated by the Bureau's leadership.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:
Develop a desert vegetation sale/permit system to salvage vegetation in areas to be disturbed, such as roadways, pipelines, proposed burn areas, etc., to provide vegetation for water conservation landscaping.

Support Needs:
Forestry, all surface disturbing activities.

Rationale:
Projections of water consumption in Las Vegas indicate water shortages around the turn of the century in the Las Vegas Valley. Approximately 60% of the water currently used in Las Vegas is expended in landscaping. By converting to water conservation landscaping, .18 to .24 acre-feet/yr/capita can be conserved. Multiplied by current Water District service to 376,000 persons and the projected year 2000 service to 640,000 persons, converting to water conservation landscaping could save 67,080 to 90,240 AF/yr now, and 115,200 to 153,600 AF/yr in the year 2000. If such conservation is not exercised, demand for water will force importation from other areas, including adjoining Bureau lands. The Bureau can promote water conservation landscaping by making desert vegetation available.

See Forestry 1.3 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.2:
Provide public land for use by entrepreneurs to develop agricultural techniques for, and to conduct commercial propagation of, desert plants.

Support Needs:
Lands, environmental education.

Rationale:
One problem with water conservation (desert) landscaping is the lack of knowledge regarding the propagation and growth requirements of the vegetation. Providing land through appropriate disposal policies would encourage entrepreneurs to develop nurseries or demonstration areas such as the Kiwanis Club's Ecologeum now (1980-81) under construction on Las Vegas Valley Water District land on Alta Drive.

Such nurseries could provide the metropolitan areas with desert vegetation for landscaping. Local availability of desert plants through commercial outlets should reduce pressures on wild vegetation also.

Such areas could also assist in educating the public towards such landscaping practices.

See Lands 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendations.

Recommendation 1.3:
Promote a sale/permit system to encourage entrepreneurs to gather desert vegetation seeds for supply to nurseries, government agencies, and others interested in native vegetation propagation.

Support Needs:
To be determined.

Rationale:
The cultural propagation of many native vegetation species is difficult because of the lack of seed sources. Also, having local sources would greatly assist in the success of fire rehabilitation or range improvements involving vegetation conversions. The scientific community could benefit by having seeds from new sources.

Multiple Use Analysis

Requests for the acquisition of desert vegetation seed are provided for in the Bureau's vegetation disposal program and will be treated in the same way. The demand for seed from commercial retailers is not known but requests are minimal. Requests to gather seed can be administered on a case-by-case basis with a stipulation attached to each permit providing that a sufficient seed source be left in an area of harvest.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Drop this recommendation.

Reason:
This recommendation is provided for by normal Bureau and District administrative procedures.

Objective 2.0:
Take action on public land in Clark County to assist in limiting flood and sediment damage to private property.

Rationale:
As the population of Southern Nevada increases, so does encroachment on floodplains. Such encroachment reduces the beneficial values of floodplains, causing a corresponding increase in flood and sediment damage. Executive Order (EO) 11988 mandates that all Federal agencies maintain the beneficial value of floodplains. Discussion with local agencies indicates a willingness to work together to minimize future flood damage.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is reflective of goals set up in the cited Executive Order. It implies a responsibility by the Bureau to act independently of its other resource management responsibilities to limit flood and sediment damage. Given the enormous amount of public land surrounding Clark County communities, this objective would commit the Bureau to staggeringly expensive preventive and rehabilitative actions.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the objective as follows:
Insure that public land management actions in Clark County do not increase the potential for flood and sediment damage to private property.

Recommendation 2.1:
Comply with EO 11988 to the fullest possible extent to restrict disposal of lands in floodplains where their beneficial value will not be maintained.

Support Needs:
Lands program.

Rationale:
EO 11988 states, among other things, that public lands within the 100-year floodplain must be retained under Federal administration except where other administrations have demonstrated the ability to maintain or restore beneficial floodplain values or where transfer is directed by legislation or Presidential order. Special attention should be given when determining lands subject for disposal under the Santini-Burton Bill.

See Lands 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.2:
Coordinate with local flood control agencies when considering land disposal or other actions which might affect floodplain management.

Support Needs:
Lands program.

Rationale:
The development of comprehensive floodplain management depends on the coordination of the activities of different agencies. Local agencies must be advised in advance, of any action which might affect their planning for floodplains or flood control facilities.

See Lands 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.3:
Provide right-of-way access where necessary for local flood control agencies to develop or maintain flood control developments. Consider such disposal as the best use of the land.

Support Needs:
Lands program.

Rationale:
Flood hazards, particularly in the Las Vegas Valley, are real. Damaging floods will occur, with possible loss of life. It is imperative that the Bureau cooperates to the fullest possible extent to reduce flood hazards. The Bureau can assist local flood control agencies by allowing local flood control agencies to develop or maintain drainage areas, "greenbelt" flood areas, etc., on or across public lands.

Multiple Use Analysis

Providing access to flood control developments through the right-of-way authority may or may not conflict with other resource values, depending upon the location, size, and situation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Drop this recommendation.

Support Needs:
None.

Reason:
Present right-of-way authorities require assessment and processing of applications on a site-specific, case-by-case basis. This allows the best multiple-use oriented decision to be made on an individual basis. Also, granting across-the-board access to "flood control developments" without proper statutory case processing would be in violation of Federal regulation.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Objective 3.0:
Maintain/improve the water quality of streams and springs on public lands in accordance with State and Federal regulations.

Rationale:
Several authorities affect the maintenance of water quality of streams and springs, including Public Laws 92-500, 94-523, and 95-217, Executive Orders 11752, 11514, and 5003, and State of Nevada criteria, regulations, and Best Management Practices, as described in the District Water Management Plan. Current degradation of spring sources appears to be in violation of State regulations. Water quality should be monitored, and a program to restore spring and stream integrity should be initiated.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective as written is consistent with Bureau policy and guidance provided by Congress. Working towards this objective will serve important public purposes and improve resource management.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 3.1:
Fence off springs and seeps currently being degraded by livestock, wildlife, or wild horses and burros to restore or maintain water quality, while providing water for these animals by piping it outside of the enclosure to a trough. Priority consideration should be given to those springs in areas with high recreational use or potential and to springs with high wildlife habitat values. Monitor water quality of springs to determine the need for, and success of, water fencings.

Support Needs:
Wildlife, Livestock, Wild Horse and Burro Programs; Division of Operations.

Rationale:
The Clark County URA indicates many springs and seeps are currently being degraded by animals trampling the source and contaminating the water with fecal material. Such contamination is inconsistent with State regulations. Maintaining water sources at their highest potential quality will benefit multiple use management of that water.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.2:
Do not allow competitive ORV events within one-quarter of a mile of any water source.

Support Needs:
Recreation-SRUP Program.

Rationale:
Inadvertent or intentional degradation of water sources may occur if ORV users view water sources, or the surrounding riparian habitat, as areas suitable for ORV traffic. Restricting competitive events from the quarter-mile zone would protect water sources from the most damaging ORV uses. The quarter-mile distance recommended is based on the Congressional and Executive determinations of that distance as the necessary area to protect public water reserves for public uses (see 43 CFR 2311.0-3(a)(1)).

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.3:
Eliminate disturbance to riparian vegetation along Las Vegas Wash, Meadow Valley Wash, the Muddy River, and the Virgin River by limiting ORV, and other surface disturbing activities.

Support Needs:
Recreation, livestock management, and other surface disturbance regulating activities.

Rationale:
Disturbance of streamside vegetation increases bank erosion and accompanying sediment production. EO 11990 requires Federal agencies to minimize wetland degradation and to preserve and enhance wetland values. BLM Instruction Memo 78-410 states that protection of streams, riparian zones, and wetlands may be accomplished by fencing, adjustments in livestock use, and establishment of buffer strips as well as other techniques.

See Wildlife 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.4:
Assess all Bureau-initiated and Bureau-authorized activities for nonpoint-source pollution potential. Minimize all such potential for pollution following Best Management Practices (BMPs) as identified by the State of Nevada. Monitor potentially impacted streams to determine the effects of such activities.

Support Needs:
All programs.

Rationale:
Nonpoint-source pollution is that pollution not readily related to a particular source. Activities related to disturbance of rangelands may contribute to water pollution. The Water Pollution Control Act (P.L. 92-500) and the Clean Water Act (P.L. 95-217) identify maintenance and restoration of water quality as a national objective. The BLM is further committed to the abatement of nonpoint-source pollution by written agreement with the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection, as described in the Memorandum of Understanding of December 31, 1980.

Multiple Use Analysis

There are no recommendations that directly conflict with this recommendation. It does complement other watershed recommendations. The recommendation has a positive social impact by providing improved water quality. However, certain activities, by their nature, could conflict with BMPs. A case-by-case analysis would determine this and identify needed resolution.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
As stated in the Multiple Use Analysis.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 3.5:
Initiate an active road maintenance program employing the use of redesign, blading, gravelling, water barring, spur ditching, and installing of culverts to reduce erosion and sediment damage caused by improper design or poor maintenance.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Improper road design or maintenance results in erosion of the road and adjacent land, and associated sediment production. Identification of areas requiring attention should be made by all field personnel and reported to Division of Operations.

See Livestock Grazing 2.3 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 4.0:
Maintain/improve watershed conditions to reduce erosion and sedimentation and to enhance site productivity.

Rationale:
Most of Clark County has land with slight to moderate erosion condition classes. Some areas have critical erosion conditions, some have deteriorating conditions, and other areas have soils highly susceptible to erosion from any disturbance. Such areas must be identified further and protected. Restricting use on some areas could deleteriously affect certain groups of land users, such as ORVers and ranchers. The designation of an ORV play area, such as in the Las Vegas Dunes and Dry Lake, and developing a Recreation Management Plan for the area, could reduce ORV disturbance elsewhere, concentrate use in a manageable area, and promote good public relations.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective, as written, is consistent with Congressional guidance provided in FLPMA (Sec. 102(a)(8)) and serves resource management goals across the board.

Multiple Use Analysis:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 4.1:
Develop a programmatic fire rehabilitation plan to ensure prompt rehabilitation before watershed degradation occurs.

Support Needs:
Fire Control Officer and Fire Boss of Overhead Team on project fires; soil scientist, vegetation specialist, hydrologist.

Rationale:
Current fire rehabilitation efforts start examining needs after the fire crew has been dispersed, and involve time delays to examine the site, write rehabilitation needs, obtain materials, and implement. These delays have taken months to complete in the past; during this time serious watershed degradation could occur. By having an in-hand rehabilitation plan, some rehabilitation needs may be completed before the fire crew, or equipment, are released from the fire. Time spent to determine site-specific rehabilitation needs can be minimized, and the overall time required to rehabilitate the site reduced.

See Forestry 3.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.2:
Develop a county-wide value-at-risk analysis, which addresses watershed values, to provide response priorities for wildfire suppression efforts.

Support Needs:
Fire Management, all activities.

Rationale:
By identifying those areas where fire would seriously harm watershed values, protection of the values would be enhanced. The analysis would also aid in determining restrictions on fire-fighting operations so that the values are not degraded by the protection effort.

See Fire 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.3:
Maintain supervision of vegetation products sale areas to protect watershed values from inadvertent degradation by clients.

Support Needs:
Forestry.

Rationale:
Unrestricted user access to wood sale areas results in unauthorized roads and in some cases serious watershed damage. This is especially harmful in burn areas, where permits are sold to collect dead wood; the Lovell Canyon burn, where unlimited use of vehicles by woodcutters established tracks and gullies, is a case in point. On-site supervision could prevent unnecessary vehicle-caused damage.

See Forestry 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.4:
Encourage recreational ORV use in designated areas, such as the Las Vegas Dunes Play Area, to offset ORV degradation of soils in more critical areas.

Support Needs:
Recreation Program; public education; contact with ORV groups.

Rationale:
By encouraging use in certain areas identified for their environmental and social suitabilities, use in other less suitable areas may be reduced. Developing an RMP would demonstrate the Bureau's commitment to provide recreational areas for ORV use while still protecting unsuitable areas.

See Recreation 1.8 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.5:
Adopt protective actions to maintain or enhance watershed conditions. Such actions should include those on Table WS-4.5.

Support Needs:
ORV Designations; Livestock Grazing, and Wild Horse and Burro programs.

Rationale:
Areas with a high erosion condition (SSF) or erosion hazard have been identified. The best way to reduce or prevent high rates of erosion on these areas is to maintain the highest possible level of ground cover. This can be done by management actions including the following:

1. Limiting ORV use on areas with critical or severe erosion conditions and/or high erosion hazards.

2. Reducing grazing or disallowing introduction of grazing animals in areas with critical or severe erosion condition until the erosion condition reaches moderate levels. Changes in erosion conditions could be evaluated following 25% incremental increases in perennial vegetation and persistent litter as determined by the trend studies used in monitoring the grazing system. In these monitoring study designs, inclusion of critical or severe watershed areas should be made.

3. Minimizing the amount of construction-related activities in areas with critical or severe erosion conditions and/or high erosion hazards.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts primarily with soil-disturbing activities such as intensive ORV usage, mining operations, construction such as pipeline and utility transmission lines, roadways, etc. These activities, particularly in soils with high erosion hazards, can break up the pavement, exposing the soil to the effects of wind and water. In the long run, adverse effects to the soils will affect the entire food chain. It directly affects man through air pollution and water quality degradation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written except for the ORV segment, which will be analyzed in Recreation 6.4.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Southern Nevada soils are relatively fragile and easily susceptible to erosion and other losses of watershed values.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Less restrictive actions.
2. More restrictive actions.

TABLE WS-4.5

SSF	Erosion		Protective Action	
Class	Hazard	ORV	Grazing	Construction
Severe	High	1	3	4
Severe	Medium	1	3	4
Severe	Low	1	3	4
Critical	High	1	3	4
Critical	Medium	2	3	4
Critical	Low	2	3	4
Moderate	High	2		4
Moderate	Medium			
Moderate	Low			
Slight	High	2		4
Slight	Medium			
Slight	Low			
Stable	High	2		4
Stable	Medium			
Stable	Low			

Protective Actions:

1. Limit all recreational ORV use to existing roads and trails.
2. Limit organized or multi-vehicular ORV use to existing roads and trails.
3. Change management of grazing animals in such a way that vegetation and plant litter ground cover is incrementally increased by 25% and the erosion condition is reduced to the moderate SSF class.
4. Minimize construction-related activities in these areas.

Recommendation 4.6:
Develop and initiate comprehensive management plans for major watersheds including BLM-administered portions of the Virgin River, the Muddy River, and Meadow Valley Wash.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
By developing comprehensive watershed improvement plans, the need for action may be identified and planned in a logical sequence of activity. Approaching the maintenance of watershed values from the crisis mode does little to prevent problems, allows small reversable problems to become major concerns, and may allow irreversible damage to range productivity and water quality to occur.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.7:
Consider the following watershed treatments as depicted on the Watershed MFP Overlay in the development and implementation of AMPs, fire rehabilitation plans, HMPs, and watershed improvement packages:

- -- Mechanical Treatments (prescribed burn as alternative)
- -- Chemical Treatments (prescribed burn as alternative)
- -- Watershed Tillage
- -- Water Control

Support Needs:
Livestock, Wild Horse and Burro, and Wildlife Habitat management programs; Fire Management Officer.

Rationale:
The Phase I WC&D Inventory identified these areas as suitable for these types of treatments. By implementing these treatments, a variety of watershed improvement goals could be achieved, including reduction of flood/sediment damage, erosion, and overland flow, and increase in infiltration, ground cover, and water quality. Considering these treatments when developing other management plans will facilitate the improvement of watershed and range conditions for a variety of resource benefits.

See Wild Horses and Burros 2.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.8:
Develop and implement an evaluation and maintenance plan for watershed control structures within Clark County.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
BLM Manual 7120 states that all water control structures will be inspected and maintained annually. Maintaining operational status of these facilities will ensure that each facility will continue to operate in its designed function--erosion control, water detention, etc. A prerequisite for maintenance is identification of all such structures on Bureau lands.

Multiple Use Analysis

The function monitoring and maintenance checks on watershed control structures are important in ensuring their proper working ability. In Clark County, where watershed values can be critical due to a high erosion potential and low water detention ability, control structures are important in regulating this resource. The well-being of other resource values, e.g., vegetation, wildlife, etc., are directly contingent on proper use of the watershed.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
The proper functioning of watershed control structures is extremely important to the quality of all other resource values.

Alternative Considered:
None

Objective 5.0:
Preserve and protect important paleontological sites.

Rationale:
Paleontology is the study of life in past geologic periods and is based on fossil plant and animal impressions found in geologic strata today. This has a scientific value when comparing today's plants and animals with those of the past. Although no important paleontological sites have been discovered in Clark County, the potential for discovery is increasing with more construction and mineral exploration associated actions. When and if such discoveries are made, protective actions, suitable to the situation, should be instituted.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective will provide management guidance as these resources are identified and brought into the multiple-use management scheme.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Objective 1.0:

Maintain and improve the condition of the public rangelands, through management of grazing animals, so that the rangelands become as productive as feasible for all range resources.

Rationale/Multiple Use Analysis

This objective, developed during MFP Step II, is reflective of an overall management goal for rangeland in Clark County. These lands support domestic livestock, wildlife, and wild horses and burros. These foraging uses represent the highest and best use of these lands, since they are unsuited, generally, for agriculture or forestry. The focus for rangeland management ought not to be the foraging animal, per se, but the vegetation and watershed resources which permit that grazing. None of the MFP Step I objectives focus on this key element, concerned as they are with the class of animal utilizing that forage. Indeed, the public rangelands, in their richness, are supportive of numerous other management programs involving human uses of that resource: watershed, recreation, fire management, forestry, etc. Lacking a healthy range, all those activities would ultimately suffer.

This objective conforms excellently to the sentiment of "multiple use" and "sustained yield" expressed in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976; to the guidance to "manage, maintain, and improve the condition of the public rangelands" found in the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978; to the mandate in FLPMA to provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife; to the regulatory requirement to manage wild horses and burros and their habitat "to achieve and maintain a thriving ecological balance on the public lands and a thriving population of sound healthy animals" (43 CFR 4700.0-6(a)); and "to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range," as called for by the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934.

To this end, the following activity recommendations will be transferred to and analyzed as Range Management recommendations:

LG 1.1
LG 1.2
LG 1.3
LG 1.6

WHB 1.2

WL 1.11
WL 1.12
WL 1.13
WL 1.14
WL 2.4
WL 2.5

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:
Determine proper stocking rates of domestic livestock on ephemeral-perennial allotments through a range monitoring system, and the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) process. Use CRMP to establish initial stocking rate for grazing year 1983. Initiate first adjustments during FY85 and attain balance of use with capacity during FY90.

Support Needs:
Wild Horse & Burro, Wildlife, and Watershed Programs, Public Affairs, funds to accomplish monitoring system.

Rationale:
Monitoring studies, incorporating basic data developed during the 1979 range survey in Clark County, will provide a clear picture of ongoing use of forage, condition of the range, and other data needed to effectively and judiciously manage grazing use over the long term. The CRMP process will assure that the interests of all parties affected by rangeland decisions are considered in reaching those decisions.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Livestock Grazing 1.1, Range Management 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8)

Because of overlapping diets among livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife, competition for forage can be intense. In Southern Nevada, where climatic conditions are extreme, the perennial forage resource is meager. Competition for such forage is keen, particularly among year-round grazers such as wildlife (Range Management 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 and Wildlife 1.22) and wild horses and burros (Range Management 1.8). For other wildlife, such as desert tortoise (Wildlife 3.5), availability of forage during the spring is an important habitat requirement. Bighorn sheep is a species particularly sensitive to competition from other grazers. In fact, historical evidence is clear that bighorn were formerly more abundant throughout Southern Nevada. Forage competition between the sheep and domestic livestock and wild burros is one major factor in the sheep population's decline from historic levels. Other factors are water and space competiton as well as disease introduced by domestic sheep.

A key element in balancing the forage supply-demand equation is the number animals grazing at different times. Livestock numbers are relatively easy to control. Wild horse and burro numbers are controllable, but with difficulty and at great expense. Wildlife populations are most difficult to control, the usual device being fall harvest of selected numbers by hunters.

(Range Management 1.1 continued)

Each class of animals has a large and vocal public expecting its interest to suffer a minimal amount when it comes to forage allocations. Big game wildlife species -- mule deer and bighorn sheep -- are favorite hunting species in the state. While Clark County ranges could never accommodate the hunting demand from Las Vegas (Recreation 2.8), increased populations of the animals could offer some assistance to NDOW in meeting the demand. The animals also are an important component of outdoor recreation in general (Recreation 2.4) and are in demand by campers, hikers and other recreationists. The small elk population on the Spring Mountain Range is important in this latter respect. In addition to these animals' role in the ecology of Southern Nevada, their recreational and hunting value is of significant economic importance to Las Vegas (PAA).

Wild horses and burros are important to a large segment of the population. The Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971 was passed unanimously by Congress amid a rarely matched outpouring of public sentiment in favor of the animals. A recent expenditure of large amounts of private funds to rescue wild burros from the Grand Canyon testifies that sentiment is still present in strength.

The livestock operators in Clark County, although few in number and representing less than one percent of the gross income of the county, perceive their operations as economically important to them. The Western livestock industry stands ready to defend that economic interest along with the historical and social implications of ranching in the West.

Use conflicts are inevitable among the three classes of animals. When the conflicts do exist, resolution may well require adverse impacts to one or more of the types of animals. Non-resolution of the conflict may well lead to severe degradation of the rangeland's vegetation and watershed values, and all
(1.1 continued)
animals will suffer those consequences.

The BLM has the responsibility to manage the rangelands so as to avoid such catastrophes. One option available to the Bureau is forage allocations through one-point-in-time range surveys. As is clear from recent public response, that option is unworkable, except in a context of drawn-out court battles. To avoid that, current Bureau policy is to initiate intensive monitoring on key areas (RM-2.0) and accomplish necessary animal population adjustments after use of consultation among rangeland interests. In Nevada, the process is called Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP). Under the January 19, 1981 change to the grazing regulations, a balance between forage supply and animal demand should be attained within five years of initial adjustments, assuming the two are well out of balance.

Recent Bureau guidance calls for the use of intensive monitoring and expenditure of public funds and efforts only on those allotments categorized as requiring "intensive" management (I).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Determine proper stocking rates of domestic livestock on ephemeral-perennial range, desirable numbers of wild horses and burros in herd management areas, and populations of mule deer, bighorn sheep, and elk

Reason:
The monitoring and CRMP systems provide the Bureau the opportunity to make sound resource decisions based on commonly agreed-to resource data and a strong public consultive process. It offers the goal of relatively quick

(Range Management 1.1 continued) county-wide, through a rangeland monitoring program covering all grazing animals, and the CRMP process. It will be the Bureau's goal to attain the reasonable numbers provided by the Nevada Department of Wildlife. (See Tables RM-1.6, RM-1.7, RM-1.8.) Starting point in FY83 will be existing numbers of wildlife and wild horses and burros, and initial stocking rates of livestock set through CRMP, or through agreement with the allotment operator.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

on-the-ground resource use management as opposed to expensive litigation an mutual distrust and acrimony among BLM and its various resource user clients.

Alternatives Considered:
Forage allocation based on range surveys.

Recommendation 1.2:
Reclassify the following allotments from ephemeral to ephemeral-perennial range. License no ephemeral use without an ephemeral range inspection.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit:
1. Arrow Canyon
2. Billy Goat Peak
3. Bunkerville
4. Dry Lake
5. Lower Mormon Mesa
6. Mesa Cliff
7. Toquop Sheep
8. Upper Mormon Mesa
9. White Basin
10. (*) Gold Butte
11. (*) Lime Springs
12. Pittman Well***
13. Azure Ridge
14. Mesquite Community

Stateline Planning Unit:
1. Ireteba Peaks
2. Hidden Valley
3. McCullough Mountain
4. Newberry Mountain***
5. Jean Lake
6. South Point
7. Crescent Peak
8. Roach Lake
9. Stump Springs
10. Lucky Strike
11. Wheeler Wash
12. Roses Spring***
13. Spring Mountain**
14. (*) Wheeler Slope**
15. (*) Kyle Canyon***
16. (*) Younts Spring
17. (*) Table Mountain
18. Las Vegas Valley (7777)**

**Unallotted
***Ungrazed since at least 1975

Support Needs:
None

Rationale:
The allotments proposed for ephemeral-perennial classification are those which produce suitable or potentially suitable perennial forage, are generally above 3,200 feet elevation, and receive over 5 inches of precipitation annually. The allotments marked with (*) have neither suitable nor potentially suitable perennial forage production, but have significant acreages exceeding the elevation and precipitation criteria. These allotments also meet the criteria outlined in the special rule for Southwest Desert (ephemeral) Range (BLM Manual 4112.5). Under the ephemeral-perennial classification a grazing preference is established and licensed under the provisions of 43 CFR 4120.2-1. The license specifies kind and number of livestock, periods-of-use, and other pertinent information. Any additional grazing would be authorized in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.3-1(a) when ephemeral forage is produced.

Ephemeral-perennial allotments have vegetation types with the potential to increase perennial forage production if managed properly.

Although Mesquite Community and Azure Ridge allotments would be ephemeral on the Nevada side of the stateline, the bulk of the allotments are in Arizona and will be managed as ephemeral-perennial by the Arizona Strip District.

Spring Mountain, Wheeler Slope, and the Las Vegas Valley are currently unallotted.

(Range Management 1.2 continued)

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Lands 1.5, Range Management 1.3 and 1.4, Livestock Grazing 1.2, 1.7, and 1.8, Wildlife 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.22, and 1.25, and Recreation 1.11)

Clark County is a marginal grazing area. This basic fact was officially recognized in 1969 when the ephemeral grazing rule for southwest desert areas, including the county, was established. Although there is some growth of perennial forage in most allotments, it is not sufficient in all of them to warrant anything but the ephemeral characterization.

The reclassification recommendation in MFP 1, Livestock Grazing 1.2, derives from a URA Step 4 table which showed those allotments which the 1979-80 range survey identified as having suitable or potentially suitable animal unit months (AUM), in some cases as few as one. In other cases, such as Hen Springs, there was no showing of suitable or potentially suitable AUMs, but the allotment easily had the majority of acreage exceeding the ephemeral range elevation and precipitation characteristics (see below).

A second method of evaluating possibilities for reclassification was used as an alternative approach. The system, dealing directly with plant composition and density in vegetation types (see URA 3/4), emphasized potential for improvement of perennial plant density under intensive management based on available seed stock on the range and favorable climatic conditions.

For both methods, the allotment, to be a reclassification candidate, would have to lie generally between the 5" and 12" precipitation zones and above 3,200 foot elevation.

Results of the two systems are shown in Table RM-1.2.

TABLE RM-1.2

Allotment	Suitable or Potentially Suitable AUMs	Density/Composition Criteria Met	Elevational & Precipitation Criteria Met
Arrow Canyon	Yes	No	No
Billy Goat Peak	Yes	No	Yes
*Bunkerville	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dry Lake	Yes	No	No
Lower Mormon Mesa	Yes	No	No
Mesa Cliff	Yes	Yes	No
Toquop Sheep	Yes	No	No
*Upper Mormon Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes
White Basin	Yes	No	No
Gold Butte	No	No	Yes
Lime Springs	No	No	No
Pittman Well	Yes	No	No
Azure Ridge	No	No	Yes
Mesquite Community	No	No	Yes
Hen Springs	No	Yes	Yes
Muddy Mountains	No	Yes	Yes
Acton-Farrier	No	No	No
Muddy River	No	No	No
Flat Top Mesa	No	No	No
Glendale	No	No	No
Jackrabbit	No	No	No
Overton Arm	No	No	No
Pulsipher Wash	No	No	No
Rox	No	No	No
Ute	No	No	No
9999 (LMNRA)	No	No	No
Ireteba Peaks	Yes	No	Yes
*Hidden Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes
*McCullough Mtn.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newberry Mtn.	Yes	No	No
*Jean Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Point	Yes	No	No
Crescent Peak	No	No	Yes
*Roach Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stump Springs	Yes	No	No
*Lucky Strike	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wheeler Wash	Yes	No	Yes
Roses Spring	Yes	No	Yes
*Spring Mtn.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wheeler Slope	No	Yes	Yes
Kyle Canyon	No	Yes	Yes
Younts Spring	No	No	No
Table Mtn.	No	No	Yes
7777 (Las Vegas Valley)	Yes	No	No
Christmas Tree Pass	No	No	No
Black Butte	No	Yes	No
6666 (River Mtn.)	No	No	No
5555 (Indian Springs)	No	No	No
Sunrise Mtn.	No	No	No

Only eight of the allotments meet all three standards, the ones marked by an (*). (However, two, Azure Ridge and Mesquite Community, are located mostly in

Arizona, are administered by the Arizona Strip District, and have been classified ephemeral-perennial in that state.) Column one indicates the allotment is currently producing suitable perennial forage, although the amounts range from some 31 AUMs on the Bunkerville allotment to more than 3,000 AUMs in the McCullough Mountains. Column two indicates a potential for improvement, with intensive management, in so far as there appears to be a significant seed source for desirable and intermediate perennial forage. Column three indicates that elevational characteristics and annual precipitation may be sufficient to sustain a good perennial forage base. However, some allotments, such as Roach Lake and Ireteba Peak Mesa, are borderline in this category.

Three allotments, Gold Butte, Table Mountain, and Crescent Peak, show neither production nor the potential for it. However, it is the professional judgement of both management and range staff that both have potential, if not current production. The judgement is based on physical tours of both allotments, and the rest of the county. In addition, all three meet the elevational and precipitation criteria.

Two allotments, Wheeler Wash and Ireteba Peaks, showed significant suitable and potentially suitable perennial forage production in the range survey, but an apparent scarcity of desirable and intermediate perennial plants over the entire allotments. The Wheeler Wash allotment has a great supply of perennial (albeit largely undesirable) forage plants and is situated well above the elevational and precipitation criteria. Livestock grazing on this allotment also has sharp conflicts with wild horses, elk, and recreational uses.

One allotment, Billy Goat Peak, also showed significant suitable and potentially suitable perennial forage production but little apparent potential for improvement based on composition of desirable and intermediate perennial forage plants. It generally is located very close to the lower end of the elevational and precipitation criteria for ephemeral-perennial range. Two others, Hen Springs and Muddy Mountains, showed potential but no production.

One of the allotments which met all three criteria for ephemeral-perennial reclassification, Upper Mormon Mesa, is judged to be in fine condition overall, and generally is at or near its full potential for production. The operators follow a natural grazing system which fits well with the terrain, watering, and vegetation growth patterns in the allotment. As it is operated, the allotment needs little BLM management attention. However, future changes in the grazing system might warrant an AMP development, and there is desert tortoise crucial habitat on the allotment.

Fifteen of the allotments are either unallotted or have had no use shown on them since 1975. Livestock Grazing 1.7 and 1.8 call for both the ephemeral and/or ephemeral-perennial privileges to be made available to the industry. Wildlife 1.17 and 1.18 ask that grazing on these areas not be permitted so that the forage could be used exclusively by wildlife -- mule deer, bighorn sheep, elk, and desert tortoise. In some cases, this would also make more forage officially available to wild horses and burros. Reserving that forage for wildlife could be especially beneficial to the elk on the Spring Mountain Range and to the desert tortoise in some of the valley areas. Bighorn sheep would particularly benefit in the River Mountains where they are strongly dependent on ephemeral forage to make it through the critical summer months. Non-grazing in Las Vegas Valley, Sunrise Mountain, and Indian Springs is

(Range Management 1.2 continued)
supported by Lands 1.5 which urges that course of action because of intense human conflicts. Non-grazing in the 9999 area would benefit the vegetation resource which is now heavily stressed by wild burros. Recreation 1.11, urging the closure of the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands to grazing, supports non-grazing in the Spring Mountain allotment.

It does not appear that non-grazing in these fifteen allotments would cause any economic hardships to operators. However, positive benefits could accrue to wildlife, recreationists, and the Las Vegas Valley area.

Both Range Management 1.3 and 1.17 call for establishment and enforcement of periods-of-use on ephemeral-perennial allotments. Range Management 1.3 urges that the periods-of-use be enforced until such time as AMPs or grazing systems can be established. Several of the allotments having potential for ephemeral-perennial grazing have, in effect, yearlong operations. While granting ephemeral-perennial status would be a long-term benefit to the operator, imposition of a strict period-of-use immediately would be a short-term disaster. Operators would have to remove livestock, but most have no place to put them during the off-period.

Most recent BLM rangeland management policy requires allotments to be grouped according to their need for management intensity under a "Selective Management" approach to rangeland administration. In Clark County, those allotments which would be reclassified ephemeral-perennial would require intensive management. Production of perennial forage is marginal, climatic conditions are marginal, soils tend to be harsh, and the competition for forage among livestock, wildlife, and wild horses and burros is strong. If those allotments are to realize their potential, and the hard conflicts resolved, resource condition must be closely monitored and use carefully controlled to reach management objectives.

The ephemeral ranges, on the other hand, have neither production nor potential for improvement. Even though the resource condition is generally fair to poor, management would not be expected to improve it. As long as the ephemeral rule is properly enforced, there should be little or no deterioration of the resource. Management should be custodial in nature with few funds and personnel efforts directed to these allotments.

Continuation of ephemeral classification would deprive those operators of no existing benefits. Reclassification of allotments could provide additional economic benefits to those operators. In addition, a more intensive management logically associated with ephemeral-perennial grazing could benefit other users, such as wildlife and wild horses and burros.

Multiple Use Recommendation:	Reason:
a. Manage the following allotments for ephemeral-perennial livestock grazing: *Azure Ridge Billy Goat Peak Bunkerville Crescent Peak Gold Butte Hen Springs Hidden Valley Ireteba Peaks Jean Lake	It is clear from range survey data, the forage plant density calculations, elevational characteristics, and precipitation, that the allotments proposed for reclassification do meet the requirements for it. Without a complicated recheck of the survey data on the Gold Butte and Crescent Peak

(Range Management 1.2 continued)
Lucky Strike
McCullough Mountain
*Mesquite Community
Muddy Mountains
Roach Lake
Table Mountain
Upper Mormon Mesa
Wheeler Wash
(*Administered by Arizona Strip District.)

Until such time as AMPs or grazing systems are established through CRMP, continue to license grazing on the foregoing allotments under the ephemeral range rule.

b. Continue to manage the following allotments for livestock grazing under the ephemeral range rule:
Acton-Farrier
Arrow Canyon
Black Butte
Christmas Tree Pass
Dry Lake
Flat Top Mesa
Jackrabbit
Lime Springs
Lower Mormon Mesa
Mesa Cliff
Pulsipher Wash
South Point
Stump Springs
Toquop Sheep
Ute
White Basin
Younts Spring

c. License no livestock grazing in the following allotments, reserving them for wildlife, wild horse and burro, and other resource uses:
Glendale
Kyle Canyon
Muddy River
Newberry Mountains
Overton Arm
Pittman Well
Roses Spring
Rox
Spring Mountains
Sunrise Mountain
Wheeler Slope
5555 (Indian Springs)

allotments, it is impossible to explain why they came out negative across the board. However, close examination by experienced range staff and management, calls for the conclusion that there is ephemeral-perennial potential on both allotments. Likewise, Wheeler Wash, Ireteba Peaks, and Billy Goat Peak show sufficient production of suitable perennial forage, and the elevational and precipitation characteristics, to warrant reclassification. However, only Wheeler Wash and Ireteba Peaks demonstrate a reasonable potential for improvement based on composition of desirable and intermediate plants. In addition, the elevation, the abundant precipitation, and the general terrain and soil characteristics in the Wheeler Wash allotment indicate a good potential for successful vegetation manipulation.

Based on potential for improvement and presence of suitable forage, the ephemeral-perennial allotments less Upper Mormon Mesa, Billy Goat Peak, Hen Springs, and Muddy Mountains should receive intensive livestock grazing management. In addition, Wheeler Wash has numerous conflicts which ought to be resolved at the activity plan level. On the other hand, based on the lack of potential, custodial management is warranted for the ephemeral allotments and for Billy Goat Peak. Maintenance management is warranted for Upper Mormon Mesa because of its current good management, fulfilled potential, and fine condition.

Finally, none of these recommendations would offer economic hardship to any operator, including those allotments where grazing use would be discontinued in favor of wildlife or other resource uses. The latter action would, in fact, have positive values for wildlife, for urban areas, and for recreational areas, such as the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands.

(Range Management 1.2 continued)
6666(River Mountains)
7777(Las Vegas Valley)
9999 (Lake Mead NRA below Gold Butte)

d. Ten of the 15 ephemeral-perennial allotments administered by the Las Vegas District should receive intensive management attention with the major share of the material, monetary, and personnel resources allocated to the planning unit dedicated to the monitoring, CRMP, and activity planning and implementation of grazing management on these allotments. These allotments are:

Bunkerville
Crescent Peak
Gold Butte
Hidden Valley
Ireteba Peaks
Jean Lake
Lucky Strike
McCullough Mountain
Roach Lake
Wheeler Wash

The ephemeral allotments, along with Billy Goat Peak, Hen Springs, Table Mountain and Muddy Mountains should receive custodial management attention, with the expenditure of only so much personnel effort and funds as to assure no degradation of resources.

e. As long as the current operation on Upper Mormon Mesa continues, that allotment should receive only maintenance management attention.

f. Management intensity on the Azure Ridge and Mesquite Community allotments will be determined by the Arizona Strip District.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Continue classification of all allotments as ephemeral.

Recommendation 1.3:
Establish periods-of-use on all ephemeral-perennial allotments in Clark County through CRMP and subsequent development of allotment management plans (AMP) or in conjunction with development of grazing systems. Until such activity planning is accomplished, manage according to the period-of-use shown in Table RM-1.3, allowing for flexibility based on plant phenology caused by annual differences in environmental factors.

Rational:
Current grazing practices are to graze during the beginning of the growing season or yearlong. Grazing in the beginning of the growing season is the most damaging to plants. Pressure on the plant's food reserves, from both initiation of growth and grazing, reduces the plant's vigor and ability to produce seeds. If grazing pressure during this time is continued, plants will continue to lose vigor and reproductive capability. Ultimately, such pressure can eliminate desirable perennial plants. Periods-of-use must be established on all ephemeral-perennial allotments to protect perennial plant species and allow perennial vegetation types the opportunity to complete their life cycles and increase in density.

In Mohave Desert vegetation types, certain environmental factors are very important in regulating the various phenological stages of perennial plants. Some of these factors are precipitation, soil temperature, and air temperature. These factors fluctuate from year-to-year, causing phenological stages to vary as much as two months. Because of this, establishing a set period-of-use is difficult. Flexibility to change a period-of-use from year-to-year must be included. Field examinations will be necessary for determining when important phenological stages of key species are occurring.

The periods-of-use in Table RM-1.3 would insure protection of perennial vegetation until an AMP or grazing system could be implemented. Grazing treatments, determined through an AMP, would then provide the necessary action to protect key species and increase forage production.

(Range Management 1.3 continued)

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.4:

Continue to manage the following allotments under the Special Rule for Southwest Desert Ranges (Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 238, December 7, 1968, and BLM Manual 4112.5), i.e., as ephemeral range. License no ephemeral use without an ephemeral range inspection.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit

1. Hen Springs
2. Muddy Mountains
3. Acton-Farrier
4. Muddy River**
5. Flat Top Mesa
6. Glendale**
7. Jackrabbit
8. Overton Arm**
9. Pulsipher Wash
10. Rox**
11. Ute
12. 9999 (on LMNRA below Gold Butte)*

Stateline Planning Unit

1. Christmas Tree Pass
2. Black Butte
3. 6666 (River Mountains)*
4. 5555 (Indian Springs)*
5. Sunrise Mountain*

* - Unallotted
** - Ungrazed since at least 1975

Rationale:

These allotments, over the great majority of their acreage, demonstrate essential characteristics of ephemeral range. There is no production of suitable or potentially suitable perennial forage. The majority of the allotment is below 3,200 ft. elevation and known rainfall patterns indicate less than eight inches is received per year.

The allotments with (*) are unallotted. Those with (**) have not been licensed for livestock grazing since at least 1975.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.5:
Determine population levels of wild horses and burros in proposed HMAs through a range monitoring system, and the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) process. Manage for existing numbers in 1983. Initiate first adjustments during FY85 and attain balance of use with capacity during FY90.

Support Needs:
Livestock, Wildlife, and Watershed Programs, Public Affairs, funds to accomplish monitoring system.

Rationale:
Monitoring studies, incorporating basic data developed during the 1979 range survey in Clark County, will provide a clear picture of ongoing use of forage, condition of the range, and other data needed to effectively and judiciously manage grazing use over the long term. The CRMP process will assure that the interests of all parties affected by rangeland decisions are considered in reaching those decisions.

See Range Management 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.6:
Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 1,918 elk AUMs of perennial forage in the allotments shown below so as to achieve reasonable numbers of elk. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support elk reasonable numbers.

TABLE RM-1.6

Big Game Area	Allotment*	Reasonable # AUM Demand
E-1	"8888"	230
	Kyle Canyon	115
	"3333"	115
	Lucky Strike	403
	Spring Mountain	153
	Wheeler Wash	902
TOTAL		1,918

*All allotments are currently ephemeral.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Clark County has one of only two populations of elk in Nevada. Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual section 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse and burro needs. BLM Manual sections 4111.31D and 4111.32D5c state that allocations will be made to accommodate the needs of a reasonable number of wildlife animals.

See Range Management 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.7:
Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 9,400 bighorn sheep AUMs of perennial forage in current habitat (as shown in Table RM-1.7) so as to achieve reasonable numbers. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support bighorn sheep reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs. BLM Manual sections 4111.31D and 4111.32D5c state that allocations will be made to accommodate the needs of a reasonable number of wildlife animals.

In addition, the desert bighorn has been designated by BLM as a sensitive species requiring special management consideration, and public interest in this animal has resulted in the formation of the Desert Bighorn Council and the Nevada Fraternity of Desert Bighorn. This management emphasis and public interest further justifies allocating forage to this historic, big game species.

See Range Management 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE RM-1.7

Big Game Area	Reasonable # AUM Demand	Allotment*
BY-1	401	McCullough
BY-2	2,040	McCullough Jean Lake Hidden Valley
BY-3	1,236	Ireteba Pks.
BY-4	502	Newberry Christmas Tree Pass
BY-5	379	Crescent Peak
BY-6	360	Spring Mtn. Table Mtn.
BY-7	1,090	Spring Mtn. Black Butte Roach Lake Table Mtn. "2222"
BY-8	1,224	"7777" Spring Mtn. Kyle Canyon
BY-9	194	"6666"
BY-10	982	Muddy Mtn. White Basin
BY-11	1,502	Muddy Mtn. White Basin
BY-12	986	Arrow Canyon Dry Lake Pittman Well Ute
BY-13	493	Billy Goat Bunkerville Hen Spr. Lime Spr.
BY-14	305	Gold Butte
BY-15	77	Upper Mormon Mesa
BY-16	307	Arrow Canyon Acton-Farrier
TOTAL	12,024	

* All allotments are presently ephemeral

Recommendation 1.8:
Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 5,850 mule deer AUMs of perennial forage in current habitat (as shown in Table RM-1.8) so as to achieve reasonable numbers. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support mule deer reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Mule deer distribution is severely restricted in Clark County. Hunter demand far exceeds allowable harvest of present populations in Clark County. Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual section 4730.3 authorized reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs.

See Range Management 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE RM-1.8

Big Game Area	Reasonable # AUM Demand	Allotment*
DY-4	150	McCullough Jean Lake
DY-2	150	Christmas Tree Pass Newberry
DY-1	4,500	"8888" Kyle Canyon "7777" "3333" Lucky Strike Spring Mtn. Table Mtn. Yount Spring Wheeler Wash
DY-5	900	Billy Goat Bunkerville Hen Spring Lime Spring Mesquite Comm.
DY-3	150	Gold Butte
Total	5,850	

* All allotments are presently ephemeral

Recommendation 1.9:
Reserve 200 lbs/acre of ephemeral forage for wildlife forage and vegetation needs before licensing any to livestock.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
The importance of annuals in the diets of bighorn and tortoises has been documented, as well as the competitive diet overlap between these species and livestock. Annuals are extremely important to quail,too (milkvetch, filaree). Rodents and non-game species use annuals as food sources, cover, and nesting materials. These species, in turn, are prey bases for raptors and coyotes. To maintain the habitat and provide the needs of many wildlife species, annuals should be reserved. Reserving 200 lbs/acre was accepted in the California Desert Plan based on the professional judgement of range conservationists. BLM Manual 4111.32D5c states it is imperative that forage be reserved for wildlife for specific areas for applicable seasons of use, and not merely assigned unit-wide.

BLM Manual 4121.31A.4 states short-term leases can be issued on ephemeral range for those areas where no conflicts exist. BLM Manual 4112.11A.4a states that care must be taken that habitat requirements are met where grazing livestock use the same areas.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Wildlife 1.15, 1.16, 3.5)

Competition for ephemeral forage can have severe impacts on wildlife, particularly in summer habitat. In many bighorn sheep ranges in Clark County, the populations are limited by that forage availability (Wildlife 1.15). The desert tortoise is particularly constrained in terms of population growth by that forage availability (Wildlife 3.5). Reserving annual forage for the desert tortoise, which is listed as "threatened" in its Beaver Dam Slope

(Range Management 1.9 continued)

habitat by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, would be a positive action by BLM to avoid such drastic action in Clark County. Assuring such forage availability for bighorn sheep which is an extremely important big game animal in Nevada, would have positive benefits to herd sizes. Benefiting that animal would be viewed as a positive action by hunters, sportsmen, and wildlife interests.

Since there is an apparent dietary overlap among wildlife and livestock, reserving such forage prior to licensing livestock use of ephemeral forage would be viewed negatively by livestock operators (Range Management 1.4). While there is the potential for negative impacts in the short run, benefiting important wildlife species now can help avoid more drastic action in the future.

Such forage reservation would also prove helpful to wild burro populations on non-perennial ranges (Wild Horses and Burros 1.1). It would aid in reducing damage to vegetation and watershed resources which those animals can inflict.

To accomplish this forage reservation it would be necessary to conduct range inspections prior to licensing (Range Management 1.2, and 1.4, Wildlife 1.6).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: In areas of crucial bighorn sheep and desert tortoise habitat, develop, through the CRMP process, an amount of ephemeral forage to be reserved, prior to livestock turnout, to serve the needs of that wildlife population. Conduct necessary field examinations prior to licensing livestock use.

Reason:
Reserving the annual forage for wildlife and other resource needs prior to licensing livestock grazing responds to critical wildlife needs, continues to accommodate livestock grazing, and seeks to avoid more drastic future action in support of critical wildlife such as desert tortoise.
Use of the CRMP process in determining the amount to be reserved will assure that all resouce use interests are reflected in setting the allocation.

The amount of forage proposed for reservation -- 200 lbs/acre -- would probably have devastating effects on ephemeral grazing by livestock. Annual per-acre production of ephemeral forage during an average precipitation year in the Stateline Planning Unit was estimated at a range of 10 to 30 lbs/acre in a 1973 study. The same is probably true of the Virgin Valley Planning Unit. Across-the-board reservation of 200 lbs/acre would also ignore the fact that the requirement exists largely in crucial wildlife habitats.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP I, and CRMP.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Reserve less annual forage.
2. Eliminate spring livestock grazing in critical habitat areas.

Recommendation 1.10:
Work with Nevada Department of Wildlife to reintroduce desert bighorn into historic habitat. Allow extension of bighorn distribution into historic habitat where reintroductions are not necessary.

Support Needs:
Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Rationale:
In 1978, the BLM and NDOW cooperatively developed an action plan to maintain bighorn distributions in current habitat and expand bighorn distributions into historic habitat. Reintroduction sites were proposed in several ranges in Clark County. Releases may be needed in the McCullough, Bird Spring, north Spring Mountain, North Muddy, Sunrise, Dry Lake, and Newberry Ranges. Other areas may receive new or increased use through habitat management. Reestablished populations would add to the potential for hunting and high quality sightseeing opportunities. The BLM-NDOW cooperative agreement requires BLM to cooperate with NDOW in transplant programs. NDOW input into Clark County planning recommends reintroducing bighorn into all suitable habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Range Management 1.11, and Wildlife 1.21 and 1.38)

The bighorn sheep is a sensitive species of great interest to a variety of sportsmen, recreationists, and wildlife interests in Southern Nevada (Recreation 2.4 and 2.8). Increased populations in Clark County would be viewed favorably by these groups, particularly in historic areas. Introductions accomplished in the Virgin Mountains in 1978 and 1980 received much favorable media coverage, both locally and regionally.

Increased populations would increase hunting opportunities, which would be a very positive social and economic action since bighorn sheep tags are highly prized (PAA).

Reintroductions, however, will most likely engender new resource conflicts between recreationists (Wildlife 1.3, 1.6), mineral development (Wildlife 1.2, 1.3, 1.5), livestock grazing (Wildlife 1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23), and wild horses and burros (Wildlife 1.23, Range Management 1.11). Eliminating or curtailing such conflicting activities would most likely cause a strong negative reaction to the reintroductions. In some cases, such as mineral operations, BLM's ability to mitigate the conflict to the benefit of the sheep is severely curtailed by law.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: Accomplish bighorn sheep introductions (and permit natural expansion) into historic habitats shown in Table RM-1.11 only after habitat management plans have been developed identifying and mitigating potential conflicts. Insure adequate public participation, including CRMP if appropriate, is conducted in developing the HMP. Provide forage for reasonable numbers of bighorn sheep identified in the HMP.

Reason:
See the Multiple Use Analysis.

Support Needs:
Range, Wild Horses & Burros, Recreation, Nevada Department of Wildlife, CRMP.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Make no reintroductions.
2. Make introductions into unallotted or ungrazed allotments (see Range Management 1.2).

Recommendation 1.11:
As reintroduction or habitat expansion of bighorn sheep occurs into historic habitat, provide, at a minimum, the bighorn sheep perennial forage identified in Table RM-1.11 so as to achieve reasonable numbers of the animal. Along with reintroduction or habitat expansion, monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to obtain the allocation required to support bighorn sheep reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs.

BLM and NDOW have cooperatively identified the opportunity to expand bighorn into all historic habitat.

In addition, the desert bighorn has been designated by BLM as a sensitive species requiring special management consideration. Public interest in this animal has resulted in the formation of the Desert Bighorn Council and the Nevada Fraternity of Desert Bighorn. This management emphasis and public interest further justifies allocating forage to this historic, big game species.

See Range Management 1.10 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE RM-1.11

Big Game Area	Projected AUM Demand	Allotment*
BPY-2	562	Hidden Valley Jean Lake
BPY-3	206	Ireteba Pks.
BPY-4	672	Newberry South Pt. Christmas Tree Ireteba Pk.
BPY-5	53	Crescent Pk.
BPY-6	384	"4444"
BPY-7	362	"4444" Black Butte Table Mtn.
BPY-8	4,190	"4444" Younts Sp. "3333" Wheeler Wash "8888" Lucky Strike
BPY-11	552	Upper Muddy Mtn. Glendale Muddy R. Muddy Mtn. White Basin
BPY-12	38	Dry Lake Pittman Well
BPY-2	562	Hidden Valley Jean Lake
BPY-13	874	Billy Goat Bunkerville Hen Spring Lime Spring Mesquite Comm.
BPY-14	2,172	Azure Ridge Gold Butte "9999"
BPY-17	290	Sunrise
BPY-18	485	Muddy Mtn. Dry Lake
Total	10,840	

* All allotments are ephemeral at present

Objective 2.0:
Monitor use of range resources by all foraging animals to provide data needed to balance range use to range capacity.

Rationale/Multiple Use Analysis

This objective replaces Livestock Grazing Objective 2.0, and incorporates Livestock Grazing recommendations 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. To effectively manage the public rangelands for "multiple use" and "sustained yield," as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, it is essential that the manager be constantly aware of the utilization rate, condition, and trend of the vegetation resources. Concurrently, he requires up-to-date information on the numbers and condition of all range vegetation users (livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife) to ascertain the changing sources of the demand. In addition to those two factors, the managers must be aware of such competitive elements between different classes of animals as dietary overlap, habitat usage, and water requirements. An effective monitoring program, intelligently designed to illustrate each of these areas, will provide the manager, and the public, the data necessary to make resource allocation decisions, if necessary, among competing range users - to bring demand in balance with supply.

Monitoring, of course, is an expensive effort. It would be wise, therefore, to concentrate monitoring efforts on those areas where the resource management need is most intensive or where the existing conflicts are most severe. At the same time, the program should be flexible, deleting monitoring in areas where it is no longer needed, initiating it when proplems arise.

In 1980, a multi-agency task force led by the Extension Service of the University of Nevada, Reno, developed a monitoring system for rangelands which was intended as an agreed-upon minimum system. Managers can initiate additional studies to provide needed information. BLM adopted that system for use state-wide. The system is intended for use in conjunction with the CRMP process.

A monitoring program would not engender resource conflicts, although it will certainly illustrate them. It would have a high value to competing resource interests -- to the degree they were involved in monitoring -- in that it would provide a common, jointly-arrived-at data base on which to make necessary resource allocation decisions. It would serve BLM by expediting resource management decisions by largely eliminating arguments over data adequacy.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written. Conduct monitoring studies on rangelands requiring intensive management or where severe conflicts exist. Assure all grazing ungulates, and sensitive species such as desert tortoise, are monitored by the program. Assure related animal data (numbers, competitive uses) is gathered. Use the state-wide system as a system base.

Reason:
The monitoring program is required to effectively support good range management and to give a sound data base for BLM management decisions regarding resource allocations where necessary.

Support Needs:
Livestock Grazing, Wildlife, Wild Horse and Burro.

Alternative Considered:
None

Objective 1.0:
Manage grazing of the Federal range in Clark County for an optimum yield of forage for use by domestic livestock.

Rationale:
Livestock grazing on public land has occurred in Clark County since the late 1800s. Livestock grazing is the main agricultural use for the Federal lands since lack of water and poor soils make cultivation impractical. Management is needed to obtain the best possible yield of livestock forage to meet the demands of livestock grazing, while assuring that the forage continues to be available on a sustained yield basis. Although climatic conditions result in a smaller per-acre yield than other regions, the fragility of the ecosystem warrants good management to preserve a continuous, useable forage base.

Regulation of livestock grazing on Federal range first occurred under the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. Grazing in Clark County is conducted under 43 CFR 4100 which provides the basic guidance for range administration. Additional Congressional guidance is provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579) and the Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-514).

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective, as written, generally reflects a balanced approach to livestock grazing as one of several resource uses. It would be more reflective of FLPMA guidance were the "optimum" yield changed to "sustained" yield.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the objective to read: Manage grazing of the Federal range in Clark County for a sustained yield of forage for use by domestic livestock.

Recommendation 1.1:
Determine proper stocking rates of domestic livestock on ephemeral-perennial allotments through a range monitoring system, and the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) process. Use CRMP to establish initial stocking rate for grazing year 1983. Initiate first adjustments during FY85 and attain balance of use with capacity during FY90.

Support Needs:
Wild Horse & Burro, Wildlife, and Watershed Programs, Public Affairs, funds to accomplish monitoring system.

Rationale:
Monitoring studies, incorporating basic data developed during the 1979 range survey in Clark County, will provide a clear picture of ongoing use of forage, condition of the range, and other data needed to effectively and judiciously manage grazing use over the long term. The CRMP process will assure that the interests of all parties affected by rangeland decisions are considered in reaching those decisions.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.1.

Recommendation 1.2:
Reclassify the following allotments from ephemeral to ephemeral-perennial range. License no ephemeral use without an ephemeral range inspection.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit:
1. Arrow Canyon
2. Billy Goat Peak
3. Bunkerville
4. Dry Lake
5. Lower Mormon Mesa
6. Mesa Cliff
7. Toquop Sheep
8. Upper Mormon Mesa
9. White Basin
10. (*) Gold Butte
11. (*) Lime Springs
12. Pittman Well***
13. Azure Ridge
14. Mesquite Community

Stateline Planning Unit:
1. Ireteba Peaks
2. Hidden Valley
3. McCullough Mountain
4. Newberry Mountain***
5. Jean Lake
6. South Point
7. Crescent Peak
8. Roach Lake
9. Stump Springs
10. Lucky Strike
11. Wheeler Wash
12. Roses Spring***
13. Spring Mountain**
14. (*) Wheeler Slope**
15. (*) Kyle Canyon***
16. (*) Younts Spring
17. (*) Table Mountain
18. Las Vegas Valley (7777)**

**Unallotted
***Ungrazed since at least 1975

Support Needs:
None

Rationale:
The allotments proposed for ephemeral-perennial classification are those which produce suitable or potentially suitable perennial forage, are generally above 3,200 feet elevation, and receive over 5 inches of precipitation annually. The allotments marked with (*) have neither suitable nor potentially suitable perennial forage production, but have significant acreages exceeding the elevation and precipitation criteria. These allotments also meet the criteria outlined in the special rule for Southwest Desert (ephemeral) Range (BLM Manual 4112.5). Under the ephemeral-perennial classification a grazing preference is established and licensed under the provisions of 43 CFR 4120.2-1. The license specifies kind and number of livestock, periods-of-use, and other pertinent information. Any additional grazing would be authorized in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.3-1(a) when ephemeral forage is produced.

Ephemeral-perennial allotments have vegetation types with the potential to increase perennial forage production if managed properly.

Although Mesquite Community and Azure Ridge allotments would be ephemeral on the Nevada side of the stateline, the bulk of the allotments are in Arizona and will be managed as ephemeral-perennial by the Arizona Strip District.

Spring Mountain, Wheeler Slope, and the Las Vegas Valley are currently unallotted.

(Livestock Grazing 1.2 continued)

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.2.

Recommendation 1.3:
Establish periods-of-use on all ephemeral-perennial allotments in Clark County through CRMP and subsequent development of allotment management plans (AMP) or in conjunction with development of grazing systems. Until such activity planning is accomplished, manage according to the period-of-use shown in Table LG-1.3, allowing for flexibility based on plant phenology caused by annual differences in environmental factors.

Rationale:
Current grazing practices are to graze during the beginning of the growing season or yearlong. Grazing in the beginning of the growing season is the most damaging to plants. Pressure on the plant's food reserves, from both initiation of growth and grazing, reduces the plant's vigor and ability to produce seeds. If grazing pressure during this time is continued plants will continue to lose vigor and reproductive capability. Ultimately, such pressure can eliminate desirable perennial plants. Periods-of-use must be established on all ephemeral-perennial allotments to protect perennial plant species and allow perennial vegetation types the opportunity to complete their life cycles and increase in density.

In Mohave Desert vegetation types certain environmental factors are very important in regulating the various phenological stages of perennial plants. Some of these factors are precipitation, soil temperature, and air temperature. These factors fluctuate from year to year, causing phenological stages to vary as much as two months. Because of this, establishing a set period-of-use is difficult. Flexibility to change a period-of-use from year-to-year must be included. Field examinations will be necessary for determining when important phenological stages of key species are occurring.

The periods-of-use in Table LG-1.3 would insure protection of perennial vegetation until an AMP or grazing system could be implemented. Grazing treatments, determined through an AMP, would then provide the necessary action to protect key species and increase forage production.

(Livestock Grazing 1.3 continued)

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.3.

TABLE LG-1.3

RECOMMENDED PERIODS-OF-USE

Virgin Valley Planning Unit

Arrow Canyon	10-15 to 4-15
Billy Goat Peak	6-15 to 2-15
Bunkerville	5-15 to 3-01
Dry Lake	11-01 to 3-15
Lower Mormon Mesa	9-15 to 4-15
Mesa Cliff	10-15 to 3-15
Toquop Sheep	3-15 to 5-30
Upper Mormon Mesa	9-15 to 4-30
White Basin	10-15 to 4-15
Gold Butte	5-15 to 2-15
Lime Springs	6-01 to 11-15
Pittman Well	10-15 to 4-15
Azure Ridge	10-15 to 4-30
Mesquite Community	10-15 to 4-30

Stateline Planning Unit

Ireteba Peaks	6-15 to 3-15
Hidden Valley	6-15 to 3-15
McCullough Mountain	6-15 to 3-15
Newberry Mountain	6-01 to 2-15
Jean Lake	6-01 to 3-01
South Point	6-01 to 2-15
Crescent Peak	Currently managed under AMP
Roach Lake	6-01 to 3-01
Stump Springs	6-01 to 2-15
Lucky Strike	6-15 to 3-15
Wheeler Wash	6-15 to 3-15
Roses Spring	6-15 to 3-30
Spring Mountains	6-15 to 3-30
Wheeler Slope	6-15 to 3-15
Kyle Canyon	6-15 to 3-15
Younts Spring	6-01 to 3-01
Table Mountain	6-01 to 3-01
Las Vegas Valley (7777)	6-01 to 3-01

Recommendation 1.4:
Through the CRMP process, develop AMPs on the following allotments.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit
1. Bunkerville
2. Gold Butte
3. Billy Goat Peak
4. White Basin

Stateline Planning Unit
1. Ireteba Peaks
2. Hidden Valley
3. McCullough Mountain
4. Jean Lake
5. Wheeler Wash

Support Needs:
Wildlife, Wild Horses and Burros.

Rationale:
AMPs will provide maximum natural improvement of native forage species by providing a high level of management intensity. A "given" in the process is that the needs of the forage plants improvements involved in the AMP will assist in meeting management objectives. A grazing system developed specifically for each allotment should provide uniform distribution of livestock over the allotment.

An AMP should not be developed for the Spring Mountain or Wheeler Slope allotments until such time as they are allotted.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 4.6, Wildlife 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, and 3.7, and Cultural Resources 1.1 and 1.9)

Activity plans are intended to guide specific resource uses in specific areas. Among other aims, such plans should resolve local-level conflicts.

Recommendations came from Wildlife (2.7, 2.6, 2.2, 2.1, 2.3, 3.7), Wild Horses and Burros (1.3), Cultural Resources (1.9, 1.1), Watershed (4.6), and Recreation (1.3, 1.5, 2.9, 2.10, 1.2, 1.8, 1.6, 5.1). Many of these proposals deal with the same area and involve conflicting resources. For example there are to be written for the general Virgin Mountain area plans for desert tortoises, bighorn sheep, livestock (domestic sheep included) grazing, and recreation. The potential for conflict among those four uses is enormous, yet none of the plans, as proposed, would be developed concurrently. Virgin Mountain, in fact, has a current bighorn sheep/domestic sheep conflict which resulted largely from such non-coordinated actions by different resource programs.

Several competing resource use activities are aimed at the Spring Mountain Range. Under Recreation Objective 5.0 it was determined that recreation would be the primary use in that area.

The grazing allotments identified for intensive management changed as a result of the multiple use analysis in Range Management 1.2. Allotment Management plans are to be written in the following allotments: Wheeler Wash, Gold Butte, Bunkerville, McCullough Mountain, Hidden Valley, Ireteba Peaks, and Jean Lake.

(Livestock Grazing 1.4 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: Develop and implement the activity plans identified for the county. If at all possible, combine efforts into a single coordinated plan. Failing that, insure separate plans on the same area are totally coordinated. In the Spring Mountain Range above the 5,000 foot elevational contour, all activity plans will be coordinated with and subordinated to recreation plans. AMPs will be developed for the following allotments: Wheeler Wash, Gold Butte, Bunkerville, McCullough Mountain, Hidden Valley, Ireteba Peaks, and Jean Lake. Table LG-1.4 suggests a planning sequence which may be used if funding and other constraints permit.

Reason:
Proper multiple use management requires a totally coordinated effort of all programs.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Alternative Considered:
Do activity planning for single resource interests only.

Table LG-1.4

	AMP	HMP-DT	HMP-BHS	HMP-ELK	HMP-OTHER	RAMP	HMAP	Watershed	CRMP
FY 83	Wheeler Wash Gold Butte Bunkerville	Horse springs Wash Virgin Mtn.	Gold Butte Virgin Mtn.	Cold Creek/ Wheeler Wash	Cold Creek/ Willow Creek	Cold Creek/ Wheeler Wash Virgin Mtn.	Gold Butte		Willow Sp.
FY 84	McCullough Mtn. Crescent Peak Hidden Valley	Riverside Piute Valley	McCullough Mtn Highland Range	Trout/Lovell	Virgin River	Virgin River Trout/Lovell	Trout/Lovell	Virgin River	
FY 85	Ireteba Peaks	Eldorado Valley	Eldorado			Eldorado Valley Las Vegas Dunes	Eldorado Mtn.		
FY 86	Jean Lake	Goodsprings Sheep Mtn.	Bird Spring			Jean/Ivanpah			
FY 87		California Wash	Muddy Mtn. Dry Lake Mtn.			Kyle/Lee	Muddy Mtn. Kyle/Lee		Muddy Mtn.
FY 88		Moapa Red Rock	Red Rock			Mt. Potosi	Mt. Potosi	Muddy River	
FY 89		Arrow Canyon	Arrow Canyon North Spring						
FY 90			Sunrise Newberry			Sunrise		Meadow Valley Wash	
FY 91			South Spring NY-Castle						

Recommendation 1.5:

Through the CRMP process, review the Crescent Peak AMP and evaluate its success in meeting its range management objectives. Revise the plan as necessary. Complete the review and adjustment during FY84.

Support Needs:

CRMP, Wildlife and Watershed programs.

Rationale:

Crescent Peak is the only allotment in Clark County with an AMP. Approved in 1972, the plan was fully implemented, except for a pipeline project, in 1974. The operator has often stated that he feels the plan is too complex. Over the seven-year life of the plan, a data base has been acquired through monitoring to facilitate the review process.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Wildlife 1.26)

The Crescent Peak AMP has been in operation since 1972. A significant amount of data has been gathered to support an evaluation. In addition, the operator has experienced some difficulties and has requested this analysis. There are no conflicts, and Wildlife 1.26 supports the recommendation. Wildlife is concerned that conflicts with livestock be resolved.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:

An evaluation of this AMP is needed to insure that proper management is being accomplished. Enough data has been collected to determine if the AMP objectives are being met, identify an conflicts with wildlife, and if Bureau standards are being met.

Alternative Considered:

No evaluation or revision of the AMP.

Recommendation 1.6:
Continue to manage the following allotments under the Special Rule for Southwest Desert Ranges (Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 238, December 7, 1968, and BLM Manual 4112.5), i.e., as ephemeral range. License no ephemeral use without an ephemeral range inspection.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit

1. Hen Springs
2. Muddy Mountains
3. Acton-Farrier
4. Muddy River**
5. Flat Top Mesa
6. Glendale**
7. Jackrabbit
8. Overton Arm**
9. Pulsipher Wash
10. Rox**
11. Ute
12. 9999 (on LMNRA below Gold Butte)*

Stateline Planning Unit

1. Christmas Tree Pass
2. Black Butte
3. 6666 (River Mountains)*
4. 5555 (Indian Springs)*
5. Sunrise Mountain*

* - Unallotted
** - Ungrazed since at least 1975

Rationale:
These allotments, over the great majority of their acreage, demonstrate essential characteristics of ephemeral range. There is no production of suitable or potentially suitable perennial forage. The majority of the allotment is below 3,200 ft. elevation and known rainfall patterns indicate less than eight inches is received per year.

The allotments with (*) are unallotted. Those with (**) have not been licensed for livestock grazing since at least 1975.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.4.

Recommendation 1.7:
Dispose of ephemeral forage on all unallotted areas in Clark County through an annual two-week simultaneous application period each January. Award licensing privileges on each unallotted area for the grazing year beginning the following March 31 under 43 CFR 4110.3-1 and 4110.5. Successful applicants would be granted temporary non-renewable licenses during the year as annual forage became available.

Virgin Valley Planning Unit
1. "9999" (South of Gold Butte, LMNRA)

Stateline Planning Unit

1. Wheeler Slope
2. Spring Mountain
3. Roses Spring
4. "5555" (Indian Springs)
5. Sunrise Mountain
6. "7777" (Las Vegas Valley)
7. "6666" (River Mountains)

Support Needs:
Range Inspections, Advertisements, Coordination with adjacent land management agencies.

Rationale:
There are currently eight unallotted areas in Clark County. Ephemeral production on these areas can total as much as 1,500 lbs/acre of usable forage, which is available to livestock. These areas should be made available to any interested person in the livestock business. 43 CFR 4110 and 43 CFR 4110.3 provide the mechanism for disposal of such additional forage.

Successful applicants would be required to provide their own waters.

Licensing privileges would be offered annually on Spring Mountain and Wheeler Slope only until they were permanently adjudicated (see Livestock Grazing 1.9), when the allotment operator would be entitled to use of the ephemeral forage there.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.8:

Offer the perennial grazing privileges on the following allotments for permanent adjudication to qualified members of the livestock industry in FY84.

1. Spring Mountain
2. Roses Spring
3. Wheeler Slope
4. Las Vegas Valley

Support Needs:

Advertisement, Adjudication process.

Rationale:

The privileges on the Spring Mountain and Roses Spring allotments have been unallotted for several years. The Nevada Division of State Parks acquired the base property for the Spring Mountain allotment when it purchased the Spring Mountain Ranch. The base property for the Roses Spring allotment is owned by a private corporation. Neither the Division or the corporation are in the livestock business, and are not, therefore, qualified applicants for the privileges. The Wheeler Slope operator lost his privileges in the early 1970s when it was found his offered base property waters did not service the allotment. While perennial forage is found in the Valley, there has been no grazing there for several decades. All areas have enough suitable perennial forage plants present to warrant reclassification as ephemeral-perennial range. Adjudication of the perennial grazing privileges would provide effective use of the forage resource in accordance with the grazing regulations. Before adjudicating the privileges, the applicant must comply with 4110.2-1(a) regarding ownership or control of base property.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.9:
Remove, by 1986, wild horses and burros from all allotments in Clark County where they are present.

Support Needs:
Palomino Valley Horse Capture Crew.

Rationale:
Wild horses and burros are direct competitors for forage use with livestock. Continued growth of the population of these feral animals, estimated at 18% per year, will heighten the competition, causing either range damage or reduced livestock use of forage. In some use areas identified as ephemeral ranges, such as Gold Butte, Ireteba Peaks, and White Basin, use is already occurring where perennial forage is insufficient to support yearlong grazing pressure. Continued yearlong use pressure would not permit improvements anticipated for livestock grazing forage.

See Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.10:	Rationale:
Initiate modified suppression efforts on wildfires in those areas where fire would be beneficial for the livestock forage resource. Refer to MFP 1 Overlay.	Wildfires could be very beneficial in certain vegetation types throughout Clark County. Many undesirable plant species are destroyed by fire, reducing competition with more desirable plant species and improving range condition as the more desirable species increase.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 2.0:
Encourage and assist the range users to develop new livestock management facilities and to improve existing management facilities as an aid to maintaining or improving range condition and trend.

Rationale:
Livestock management facilities, such as fences, water developments, and corrals, are needed to achieve good livestock management. Without these management facilities, livestock would continue deteriorating range resources. To achieve proper management as described in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) (P.L. 94-579) Sec. 102(a)(8), and Public Rangeland Improvement Act (PRIA) (P.L. 95-514) Sec. 2(b)(2), new management facilities must be developed and existing facilities must be improved.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is consistent with the laws cited as well as the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:
Develop a maintenance schedule that will bring all range improvements to good operating condition by 1990. Where the range improvement is not maintained, identify and curtail the benefit intended to accrue to the allotment as a result of the improvement.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Many management facilities have not been maintained, making these facilities no longer useable. Management facilities are located throughout the area and are important for control of livestock and uniform livestock distribution. If proper management is to be achieved, maintenance of existing facilities must be completed to keep facilities in good condition.

Range users must be encouraged to maintain and repair those facilities they are responsible for. Range users and the range forage will benefit from these facilities only if these facilities are in good condition.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Wildlife 1.24, 1.33, and 1.36)

Maintenance is needed to correct deficiencies or to repair many range improvements in Clark County. Often, certain benefits accrue to the operator, such as increased grazing use, based on the presence of the improvement. Wildlife recommendation 1.33 indicates the need for escape devices for birds and small animals in about 70 existing troughs or tanks. Wildlife recommendation 1.24 identifies six existing fences which are presently hindering wildlife movement. Unless proper installation of new projects is accomplished, considering other resource values including wildlife, wild horses and burros, and recreation, such projects may create new conflicts.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Develop a maintenance schedule that will bring all range improvements to good operating condition and on regular maintenance schedules by 1990. Include those existing improvements identified in Wildlife recommendations 1.24 and 1.33 that need to be corrected. Where maintenance is not

Reason:
This multiple use recommendation would insure that the investment in existing range improvements is not lost. At the same time, existing deficiencies in range improvements (particularly water developments and fences) which do not conform to established BLM

accomplished, curtail or eliminate the benefit accruing from the improvement.

Future improvements will be coordinated with other resource interests (including Nevada Department of Wildlife) to alleviate potential conflicts.

Future water developments should be designed to include escape devices and other facilities (drinkers) which will be constructed concurrently.

Future fences will be built to applicable wildlife specifications in BLM Manual 1737.

guidelines can be corrected. Conflicts among different resource uses on future improvements would be reduced.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Alternatives Considered:
None

Recommendation 2.2:
Encourage and assist range users in developing new water sources (other than base waters), maintaining existing water facilities, and using pipelines to improve livestock distribution. A list of such projects is in Table LG-2.2.

Support Needs:
Sites will be determined after field examinations, archeological clearances, and proper reports have been filed.

Rationale:
Water is the major limiting factor affecting livestock distribution in this area. Many water facilities have been allowed to deteriorate and are no longer dependable water sources. These unusable water facilities, along with those areas which are not serviced by water, have caused livestock to overuse areas around dependable water. This results in degradation of the vegetation resource in those areas.

Forage is available in many areas but is never used due to lack of water. By developing new water sources and repairing existing waters, proper distribution and uniform utilization can be achieved. This will improve range conditions and permit increased production in those areas where increased production is possible.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE LG-2.2
PROPOSED FENCES AND WATER DEVELOPMENTS

Christmas Tree Pass:
- Install water haul at Deep Well
- Install water haul at Battleaxe Well
- Install water haul at Coast Guard Loran Station
- Pipe water across U.S. Highway 93 from CalNevAri to present water haul site
- Redrill Juniper Well
- Install 2-3 miles of pipeline from Cottonwood Spring

Ireteba Peaks:
- Drill a well to replace service area of the 3 water hauls on the east side of U.S. Highway 93
- Install 3-4 miles of pipeline from Desert Queen Well south

Jean Lake:
- Improve McClanahan South Well
- Improve flow of Granite Springs
- Improve flow of Scotts Well Spring
- Install 1 mile of pipeline south from Jean Lake well
- Install pipeline 2-3 miles west from Calada Well
- Redrill old wells at millsite
- Build 5-6 miles of fence across Jean Lake

Kyle Canyon:
- Improve base waters to produce 300 gallons per AUM.

McCullough Mountain:
- Fence the east side of U.S. Highway 93 to Railroad Pass
- Install 2 miles of pipeline north from 10 Mile Well with 2 troughs
- Build a reservoir halfway between Searchlight and 10 Mile Well
- Install 1 mile of pipeline from mining claim in Crescent Peak allotment to a point 3.5 miles west of Little Well
- Make a holding corral in the Brewer Well area
- Build 4 miles of fence from west slope of the North Highland Range to the McCullough Range

Upper Mormon Mesa:
- Install approximately 4 miles of pipeline from Upper Mormon Mesa Well
- Restore Reservoir #2 which was abandoned.

Bunkerville:
- Install 8 miles of pipeline from Key West to the Black Ridge area
- Water haul north of Virgin River

Flat Top Mesa:
- Install a new well which would service the entire allotment

Crescent Peak:
- Increase storage at Cripple Jack Well
- Install another trough at 6 Mile Pipeline
- Drill a well in Monday Basin in California
- Develop water from CalNevAri
- Extend a pipeline from the YKL pipeline to replace the service area of Jack's Well

Recommendation 2.3:
Upgrade and maintain all BLM managed roads throughout Clark County.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations

Rationale:
Improved access to many areas would benefit both range users and BLM personnel. Many roads throughout Clark County have deteriorated, making travel slow and dangerous in some cases. Properly maintained roads would reduce the time and difficulty needed to reach many areas. BLM personnel would be able to inspect those areas which are currently inaccessible; range users would also be able to reach these areas, making livestock management easier.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 3.5)

All roads in Clark County, which are under BLM administration and have been identified by BLM for access and maintenance, are repaired and/or upgraded on an as-needed basis as funding permits.

There are seemingly endless miles of roads on BLM administered lands, not maintained by BLM or other entities, which have not been identified for inclusion into the system of BLM maintained roads. The maintenance or improvement of many of these roads may not be advantageous or cost-effective.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Drop the recommendation.

Reason:
All BLM identified and managed access roads are already maintained, as funding permits, as a matter of policy and standard operating procedure.

Recommendation 2.4:
Encourage and assist range users in constructing fences and other projects where needed to improve management. See Table LG-2.2.

Support Needs:
Archeological investigations for each project, engineering assistance (layout and design), contract preparation for BLM projects.

Rationale:
Fences are needed to control livestock movements between and within allotments and to attain more uniform livestock distribution. Uniform livestock distribution patterns will improve utilization over the area and improve range condition in those areas where improvement is feasible.

Permittees must be encouraged to construct facilities on the allotments on which they have grazing permits. The permittees will receive the most benefit from the facilities constructed on the allotments.

Multiple Use Analysis

Fences and range projects, such as corrals, are important livestock management tools. Principal conflicts for fences are with wildlife, wild horses and burros, and recreationists. Wildlife can be cut off from important habitat by fences. Ranging patterns of wild horses can also be interrupted. Recreationists, when blocked from certain areas by thoughtlessly constructed fences, sometimes will cut the fence, destroying its usefulness.

Multiple Use Recommendation
Accept the recommendation as written with the addition of the following: Insure the preservation of normal wild horse distribution and movement patterns. Construct all fences to meet wildlife standards.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason
Livestock management tools should not interfere with other resource uses.

Alternative Considered:
Construct no fences.

Recommendation 2.5:

Designate areas open for greenwood cutting by the public in the following allotments:

Wheeler Slope
Wheeler Wash
Lucky Strike
Kyle Canyon
Spring Mountain
Roses Springs
(Refer to MFP 1 Overlay)

Support Needs:

Location of exact sites, environmental assessments, archeological clearances, and compliance checks.

Rationale:

Cutting of pinyon-juniper in these allotments sould release understory grasses and shrubs, increasing desirable forage species. Thinning thick stands will also improve management of livestock for operators.

See Forestry 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 3.0:
Initiate a studies program to provide data on a continuing basis which will enable the Bureau to more efficiently manage the range resource.

Rationale:
The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) directs the Bureau to "maintain on a continuing basis an inventory of range conditions." The Public Rangelands Improvement Act, Sections 2(b) and 4(a), provide similar guidance. Studies must be established which will allow the Bureau to monitor the range resources and use the data collected to properly manage these resources. There are no current studies on ephemeral ranges for determining turn-out dates, annual stocking rates, and condition and trend. A program must be adopted to gather the data necessary for making these vital management decisions.

Multiple Use Analysis

A studies program is a basic management tool needed to properly allocate resources among users. However, a more complex monitoring program, which addresses all rangeland foragers, is needed.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Delete this objective. See Range Management Objective 2.0.

Recommendation 3.1:
Initiate plant phenology studies throughout Clark County.

Support Needs:
Funding

Rationale:
The information from phenology studies will aid in establishing periods-of-use on all proposed ephemeral-perennial allotments and in those areas where an AMP is proposed. Data received from these studies can also be used to determine "pasture-move dates" for livestock.

Combined with Range Management Objective 2.0. This recommendation should be retained at MFP 1 and Range Management Objective 2.0 brought forward to MFP 2.

Recommendation 3.2:
Establish minimal utilization, condition, and trend studies on ephemeral allotments where improvement in perennial production appears feasible. Allotments are identified in Livestock Grazing recommendation 1.7

Support Needs:
Funding

Rationale:
The establishment of these study plots will facilitate the 1993 evaluation of these allotments for reclassification from ephemeral to ephemeral-perennial.

Combined with Range Management Objective 2.0. This recommendation should be retained at MFP 1 and Range Management Objective 2.0 brought forward to MFP 2.

Recommendation 3.3:	Rationale:
Set up the forage production inventory process on vegetation types representative of Clark County.	The forage production inventory method determines the amount of forage produced by the amount of moisture an area receives. Data gathered from this method can be used to determine the amount of usable forage produced in different vegetation types. Based on this data, decisions can be made on the proper stocking levels of livestock in both ephemeral and perennial types to insure that overuse of forage does not occur.

Combined with Range Management Objective 2.0. This recommendation should be retained at MFP 1 and Range Management Objective 2.0 brought forward to MFP 2.

Recommendation 3.4:
Establish and maintain large (five acre) exclosures for study plots to be used as comparison areas for observation of effects of management.

Support Needs:
Sites for study exclosures will be determined through the CRMP process, and field examinations.

Rationale:
Exclosures are an accurate means of determining if management objectives are being accomplished. By excluding livestock these areas will remain undisturbed and proceed in a natural succession to climax vegetation. These areas can be monitored to observe successionary change. Upon evaluation of vegetation change, management objectives and procedures are subject to change.

Combined with Range Management Objective 2.0. This recommendation should be retained at MFP 1 and Range Management Objective 2.0 brought forward to MFP 2.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Objective 1.0:
Manage wild, free-roaming horses and burros in those areas on public lands in Clark County where the animals were found on the date of passage of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of December 15, 1971 (P.L. 92-195).

Rationale:
Wild, free-roaming horses and burros can be managed only in those areas which were utilized as all or part of the habitat of these animals on December 15, 1971 (43 CFR 4730.5). Aerial inventories, with both helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft, were conducted in 1973, 1974, and 1975. The information from these inventories was used to determine the areas used by the wild horses and burros as all or part of their habitat on December 15, 1971.

Multiple Use Analysis

It is probably difficult, if not impossible, to accurately determine where the animals were located in 1971 with any degree of accuracy. Bureau regulations call for management of "desirable" numbers of animals as part of the ecology of the public lands. As with wildlife, permitted expansion of habitat or its reduction, should be by management decision based on resolved resource conflicts.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the objective as follows:
Manage desirable numbers of wild, free-roaming horses and burros in four areas of public lands in Clark County.

Recommendation 1.1:
Manage wild horse and burro populations in Clark County within the boundaries of the following Herd Management Areas (HMA):

1. Gold Butte, including Grand Wash Cliffs, Arizona
2. Muddy Mountains (including Bitter Spring Valley and Black Mountains)
3. Spring Mountain Range
4. Eldorado Mountains
5. Lower Meadow Valley Wash

Support Needs:
Further inventories, population dynamics studies, Horse Management Area Plans, and coordination with the livestock and wildlife habitat management programs.

Rationale:
Herd Management Areas are designations of specific areas of land which have definite boundaries for management purposes. Present information indicates horses and/or burros were found in these areas on December 15, 1971. Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4 are ones within Clark County where the animals could sustain themselves within established use patterns and could be managed as a unit with reference to a sustained yield of the forage resource. The Lower Meadow Valley Wash population is a herd whose principal range is in the Caliente Planning Unit and should be properly managed as a Lincoln County group.

Although wild horse sign has been observed in the McCullough Mountains-Black Hills areas, no animals were observed there during the 1973 or 1979 counts. Since the forage and water conditions in that area do not appear conducive to supporting a population, it is not likely that feral horses or burros are present. Consequently it has not been recommended as an HMA.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Livestock Grazing 1.9, Wild Horses and Burros 1.3, and Wildlife 1.29)

The Bureau policy is to manage wild horses and burros where they are found on public lands, comparably with other resource values (43 CFR 4700.0-6(c)). The areas described in the above recommendation are those locations in Clark County where the animals are currently found.

A principal conflict with wild horses and burros is forage competition with livestock (Range Management 1.2 and 1.4, and Livestock Grazing 1.9) and with wildlife, particularly bighorn sheep (Wildlife 1.29). Water, in dry areas, is also a prime item of competition. The competition would presumably be most critical on ephemeral ranges.

(Wild Horses and Burros 1.1 continued)

Since horses and burros are not ruminants, they must consume more forage to meet nutrition and energy demands. The larger consumption rates can have serious consequences for the competing animals as well as the watershed resource. In fact, Watershed 4.5 calls for alteration of grazing patterns to enhance watershed values in areas now suffering degradation.

Wild horses and burros continue to have a high social value for many Americans, nationwide. Withdrawal of animals from existing ranges, without concurrent reduction of other grazers and firm evidence of severe resource damage, would meet strong resistance. Range Management recommendations (1.1, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12) call for monitoring range uses and use of the CRMP process before initiating adjustments in grazing animals.

Herd Management Area Plans (Wild Horses and Burros 1.3) are useful in identifying conflicts and resolving them. A plan for the Gold Butte area is now under preparation by the Arizona Strip District. This plan is particularly timely because reintroduced bighorn sheep in the Virgin Mountain area are expanding their habitat southward.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Manage wild horses and burros in four herd management areas in Clark County: Gold Butte, Muddy Mountains, Spring Mountain Range, Eldorado Mountains. Do not eliminate wild horses and burros from any Herd Management Areas unless justified through monitoring and coordinated through the CRMP process. Develop Herd Management Area Plans (HMAP) as outlined in Wild Horses and Burros 1.3. Insure such activity plans are developed concurrently with other resource activity plans. In particular assure that the Gold Butte HMAP is fully integrated and coordinated with the Virgin Mountain HMP during FY83.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Management of wild horses and burros should begin with existing numbers in existing ranges until a firm basis for adjustments can be attained through providing a commonly-agreed upon data base, and sufficient public consultation on the issues can assure the Bureau of general concurrence with its ultimate setting of desirable numbers and management schemes.

The Lower Meadow Valley Wash herd should be considered and managed as an extension of the Lincoln County herd.

Alternative Considered:
Elimination of wild burros from the Gold Butte area.

Recommendation 1.2:

Determine population levels of wild horses and burros in proposed HMAs through a range monitoring system, and the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) process. Manage for existing numbers in 1983. Initiate first adjustments during FY85 and attain balance of use with capacity during FY90.

Support Needs:

Livestock, Wildlife, and Watershed Programs, Public Affairs, funds to accomplish monitoring system.

Rationale:

Monitoring studies, incorporating basic data developed during the 1979 range survey in Clark County, will provide a clear picture of ongoing use of forage, condition of the range, and other data needed to effectively and judiciously manage grazing use over the long term. The CRMP process will assure that the interests of all parties affected by rangeland decisions are considered in reaching those decisions.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.5.

Recommendation 1.3:
Develop Herd Management Area Plans (HMAPs) in the following priority and as scheduled:

a. Gold Butte (FY83)
b. Spring Mountains (FY85)
c. Muddy Mountains (FY87)
d. Eldorado Mountains (FY89)

Support Needs:
Livestock and Wildlife programs; public involvement.

Rationale:
After designating Herd Management Areas, the authorized officer shall develop a wild free-roaming horse/burro management plan (43 CFR 4730.5). Management plans are necessary to outline a) specific objectives through management of the horses/burros, b) techniques for maintaining/improving habitat and health of the animal population, c) needed management facilities, and d) monitoring studies to evaluate the effectiveness of management techniques in meeting the plan's objectives.

HMAP priority development schedule is based on the number of animals in the HMA, accessibility for viewing, and present or potential damage to the environment or to the animals themselves.

The HMAP for the Lower Meadow Valley Wash area should be developed as part of the plan for the Lincoln County herd.

See Wild Horse & Burro 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.4:
Insure water remains available for wild horses/burros at those water sources in HMAs where wild horse/burro use has been identified.

Support Needs:
Livestock operators, wildlife waters managers.

Rationale:
Water sources have been identified throughout the planning area. Horses/burros have been using all available waters within the areas proposed for HMAs. Water is the most critical element necessary for survival of these animals. A change in availability of water at any source within an HMA could jeopardize the continued good health of the horse/burro populations dependent on these water sources.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.5:
Cancel domestic horse grazing privileges in the Muddy Mountains allotment.

Support Needs:
Livestock management program; grazing decision.

Rationale:
This area has been recognized as a wild burro area. Domestic horses were first licensed in this area in the mid-1950s. Burro use apparently pre-dates that introduction. Eliminating domestic horse use would prevent the exchange of disease between wild and domestic animals and prevent undue harassment of the wild animals during periodic gatherings of domestic animals pursuant to a grazing license.

Multiple Use Analysis

The operator in the Muddy Mountains allotment licenses several working horses with his livestock to avoid having to transport the animals from home base to the allotment each time he visits his herd. Use of the allotment this way does present the conflicts cited, albeit they are minor.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Drop the recommendation at this time in favor of addressing during the CRMP process.

Reason:
The problem is not so overwhelming that it can't wait a coordinated solution working with the operator in CRMP.

Objective 2.0:
Improve habitat for wild, free-roaming horses/burros in the designated Herd Management Areas.

Rationale:
Habitat improvement is needed to enhance the existence of the horses and burros in their present habitat, to allow for increases in population, to prevent having to move animals or reduce the populations, and to limit competition with native wildlife species and domestic livestock in areas where all the animals are found and heavy use of vegetation can occur.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective is consistent with Bureau policy set in regulations regarding these animals. Habitat improvement actions would benefit not only the animal, but the resource base it depends on.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:
Initiate controlled burns in Lovell Canyon, Trout Canyon, Lovell Wash, Wallace Canyon, and Wheeler Canyon areas, for habitat improvement. Use modified suppression on fires from natural causes, such as lightning, in the Spring Mountains, Bird Spring Range, and in the Gold Butte area. Seed burned areas with suitable forage species. Identify specific areas and acreages through HMAPs.

Rationale:
Controlled burns are the most economical and "cleanest" method to remove vegetation not used by grazing animals. A burn does not usually remove all vegetation from an area, so some shelter and hiding cover normally remains. Seeding quickens the recovery of the range (as opposed to allowing the burn to revegetate naturally), and reduces soil loss from erosion.

Support Needs:
Forestry, Fire Management, Wildlife, Livestock Grazing.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.2:
Chain/seed or plow/seed selected sites on the more level ridge-tops and sides near Lovell Wash, Wallace Canyon, Wheeler Pass, and Lovell Canyon.

Support Needs:

Wildlife, Divison of Operations, Livestock Grazing.

Rationale:
Vegetation in some of these areas is too sparse to "carry" a fire, but must be removed in order to let forage species recover and reproduce. Some sites must be seeded, because no preferred forage species to furnish a seed source are present. Seeding will quicken recovery of the range and reduce soil loss from wind and water erosion.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 4.7)

Mechanical treatments (chaining, plowing) for manipulation and/or removal of vegetation can be used as a tool for opening spaces or as a preliminary to reseeding of preferred forage species in low production areas, thus providing feed for wild horses and burros in the Spring Mountains. Benefits to the watershed resource in the area would also be realized through recovery of range vegetation and reduction of soil loss from erosion. Specific watershed improvements could also be realized (Watershed 4.7, 4.5). Mechanical treatments which would eventually serve to attract grazing animals to an area should be limited to areas of moderate or better erosion condition classes.

Recreation is recognized as the priority resource for management in the Spring Mountains and any mechanical treatment undertaken in this area should be coordinated with and subordinated to recreation. In Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) interim management policy is in effect and land use activities will have to be closely coordinated accordingly.

Chemical treatments (Watershed 4.7) are also effective vegetation manipulation tools. However, the opportunities are great for undesirable side effects occuring in downstream waters and wildlife populations. With the limited waters and habitat present in Clark County, such side effects could be truely devastating.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Allow mechanical treatments for vegetation manipulation throughout Clark County. Determine areas to be treated through activity plans (HMP,

Reason:
Mechanical treatments, when properly applied, can serve a wide variety of purposes to enhance the overall ecological condition and production of

(Wild Horses and Burros 2.2 continued)

AMP, etc.), and assure that the treatment serves multiple use purposes. Do not use chemical treatments in Clark County. Consider use of watershed tillage and water control facilities in activity planning for watershed improvements.

Any treatments in the Spring Mountain Range must be coordinated with and subordinated to the recreation program there.

Support Needs:
Same as MFP I.

area. The risk of long-term adverse effects on a relatively small habitat area warrant a decision not to use chemical treatments in Clark County.

Alternatives Considered:

1. No mechanical treatments countywide.
2. No mechanical treatments in the Spring Mountain Range.

Recommendation 2.3:
Close the present Blue Diamond sanitary landfill site. Require fencing of all future landfill sites with burro-proof fences, to prevent injury or death to the animals.

Support Needs:
Lands.

Rationale:
The landfill site is presently in trespass. Burros have been known to step in tin cans and have the cans slide over the hoof and become stuck. As the bottom of the can wears off, the can slips onto the leg of the animal, which can cause injury to the animal's feet and legs, and possible death.

Poisonous or noxious substances can also be left at the landfill sites which may prove fatal to the animals.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Las Vegas District is currently working with Clark County on relocation of the Blue Diamond dumpsite. Revised stipulations on dumpsite leases will provide for greater protection to wild horses and burros. These include:
1. Mandatory fencing of all landfill sites.
2. Mandatory clean-up of all sites.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Policy is presently in effect. Drop recommendation.

Reason:
As cited in the Multiple Use Analysis.

Recommendation 2.4:
Develop water sources to make AUMs, which occur outside of current water-serviced areas, available to wild horses/burros.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, archeologist, hydrologist, contract specialist.

Rationale:
Development of water would allow more uniform use of forage throughout the designated HMAs, by making "out-of-service-area" AUMs available for grazing.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendations.

Recommendation 2.5:
Cooperate with National Park Service to fence the airstrip at Echo Bay.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Although the airstrip is several miles inside the Lake Mead National Recreation Area boundary, assistance in this project by BLM would provide protection to the burros, which we manage jointly.

The burros in this area have become accustomed to air traffic and could wander onto the airstrip during aircraft landing or take-off operations, causing injury to humans and/or the animals themselves.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Bureau is responsible for the well-being of all wild burros on public lands regardless of whether or not they roam over private or National Park Service boundaries. A potential hazard exists where burros have unrestricted access to the Echo Bay Airstrip. Fencing of the boundary around the airstrip would restrict this access and eliminate the potential hazard.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
Same as MFP I.

Reason:
Wild burros are protected by Federal law and efforts should be made to ensure their safety on the public domain.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Objective 1.0:

Provide and maintain sufficient quantity and quality of food, water, cover, and space to satisfy the demands of all wildlife species utilizing habitats in Clark County through habitat improvement, protection, and proper vegetation allocation. Special emphasis should be given to Federal- and State-classified or BLM-identified sensitive species.

Rationale:

It is BLM policy to maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public demand, through consideration of the welfare and habitat requirements of all wildlife and through provision of essential requirements of wildlife (BLM Manual Section 1603.12D1 and 1603.12D3a). BLM policy states: "The essential requirements of wildlife--food, cover, and water--will be maintained so as to provide optimum edge effect and interspersion of habitat components in important wildlife areas." It is also mandated by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) to provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife. To insure the well-being of wildlife, and thereby meet an ever-increasing public demand for consumptive uses, it is the responsibility of the BLM to provide for optimum habitat of all wildlife species. WO Instruction Memorandum 80-225, January 15, 1980, outlines the appropriate legislation and mandates that apply to the above objective.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is reflective of Bureau policy and Congressional guidance in FLPMA (Sec. 102(a)(8)). It provides for the concerns associated with a key natural resource on the public lands.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the objective as follows: Provide and maintain sufficient quantity and quality of food, water, cover, and space to satisfy the demands of all wildlife species using habitats on public land in Clark County. Give special emphasis to Federal- and State-classified species and to BLM- identified sensitive species.

Recommendation 1.1:
During development of all activity plans special attention will be given to protecting riparian zones as wildlife habitat and to protecting associated native flora.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
Riparian zones are crucial sources of biological diversity providing at least a portion of the basic habitat components required for survival of many species. However, recreationists, miners, livestock, horses, and burros are drawn to these areas too. Overuse leads to loss of habitat for wildlife, loss of native flora, erosion, degradation of water quality, and decreased water quantity.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 3.3)

Principal conflicts with this recommendation arise from such activities as livestock grazing, construction, mineral exploration, wild horse and burro use, and similar uses. Protection of the riparian habitat is supported by recommendations Watershed 3.3 and Wildlife 1.32, which urge protection of this resource.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendations as written except develop limitations for surface disturbing activities on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the impacts. See Recreation 6.4 for ORV limitations.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Given the scarcity of riparian zones in Southern Nevada, special attention is warranted. Judgements on specific surface disturbing activities would best be left to a case-by-case analysis.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Prohibit all non-wildlife activities in riparian habitat.
2. Fence all such zones.

Recommendation 1.2:
Allow no new mineral leases in crucial bighorn summer habitat. Oil and gas exploration and development and new mining, sand, and gravel operations should be prohibited in the vicinity of lambing habitat during the lambing season and in crucial summer habitat yearlong. All mining, and oil and gas operators should be required to effectively close roads in bighorn habitat, which they have created or upgraded, during periods of non-use and after completion of the operation.

Support Needs:
Minerals.

Rationale:
Mining and similar activities may force sheep to avoid areas which may be valuable to them as lambing habitat, escape cover, or sources of food or water. Accompanying road development can increase chances of off-road vehicle, sightseeing, and hiking activities in bighorn habitat, thereby adding to the potential for bighorn disturbance. Mining operations can result in habitat destruction and loss of forage.

See Minerals 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.3:

Individual, seismic, mineral, and competitive off-road vehicle (ORV) use should be restricted to existing roads, trails, and washes in bighorn habitat. Competitive events should be prohibited May 1 through September 30 in crucial bighorn summer habitat, January 1 through April 30 in the vicinity of lambing habitat, and throughout bighorn habitat during the hunting season (generally mid-November to mid-December). No competitive events should be allowed in historic bighorn sheep ranges for three years following reintroductions of bighorn into these ranges.

Support Needs:

Recreation, Minerals.

Rationale:

ORV activity can lead to harassment and poaching of sheep, can keep bighorn away from waters, and can cause a loss of forage due to habitat destruction. Restricting ORV use should reduce the severity of these problems. Allowing competitive ORV events along existing roads, trails, and washes should reduce encounters between sheep and ORVs while minimizing habitat degradation. Seasonal closures should reduce stress during critical periods and afford hunters a singular, undisrupted hunting experience. Closures of ranges for three years following reintroductions should allow the sheep to adjust to their new territory and establish social stability. Harassment during this adjustment period could result in habitat abandonment. Temporary closures are authorized by 43 CFR 8364.1.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.4:
Prohibit new road or trail construction within elk habitat on the Spring Mountains.

Support Needs:
All programs.

Rationale:
Ever-increasing use by the general public is adversely affecting the limited elk population in the Spring Mountains. Approximately 135 miles of existing roads already transect elk habitat, reducing available forage for big game and other wildlife. Increased human use which would occur with more roads displaces elk through competition for space. It also results in increased poaching which is particularly detrimental to low level populations.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Wildlife 1.5 and 3.3)

Wildlife recommendations 1.4, 1.5, and 3.3 all recommend prohibiting or limiting new road or trail construction in important wildlife habitat. Allowing new road construction under the rights-of-way program (transmission lines, natural gas lines, other non-mineral needs) would be a discretionary action of the BLM. New road construction associated with mineral, and oil and gas exploration and development is less controllable. The surface management regulations (43 CFR 3809) give BLM the responsibility to require and oversee the reclamation of lands disturbed by mining activities. In advance of such activities, BLM has an opportunity to review mining plans of operation and recommend changes to plan elements. BLM has a similar opportunity to review or seek changes in plans to conduct oil and gas geophysical work under 43 CFR 3045.

Similar concerns with construction on public lands are expressed in Watershed 4.5 in areas of high erosion hazard.

Both Lands 3.4 and Minerals 1.2 urge that there be no actions taken that would preclude access to rights-of-way, withdrawals, leases, etc., and to mineralized areas. Livestock 2.3 calls for upgrading and maintenance of all BLM managed roads in the county to facilitate ranching operations.

Recreational developments in the Spring Mountain Range (Recreation 5.1) could require new or upgraded roads to provide safe access to new areas.

(Wildlife 1.4 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation	Reason
Modify the recommendation to read: 1. Encourage all users of public lands to travel existing roads or trails in crucial wildlife habitats described in Wildlife recommendations 1.4, 1.5, and 3.3. 2. Where possible, new road or trail construction should be avoided in the described crucial wildlife habitat. 3. Coordination with mineral or geophysical companies that plan road construction within the crucial habitat should be accomplished to mitigate the adverse impacts that would occur as a result of such construction. 4. Where new roads or trails are constructed to support a temporary activity, the builder will refer the road to BLM for disposition prior to project's end.	It is impossible to prohibit all road construction. Prohibition of all road construction allows no opportunity for mitigation that may result from coordination with mineral resource development companies. Referring newly constructed roads to BLM for disposition on temporary projects would provide the manager an opportunity to retain a road which might serve multiple-use purposes.

Support Needs:	Alternative Considered:
As stated in MFP I.	None

Recommendation 1.5:
No new, permanent roads or trails should be established in crucial bighorn summer habitat.

Support Needs:
All activities, especially Lands and Minerals.

Rationale:
As with mining operations, lands activities may force sheep to avoid valuable habitat and forage or water resources. Road development may add to the potential for bighorn disturbance and loss of habitat. While disturbance can be a problem throughout bighorn habitat, disturbance in crucial habitat may be significantly limiting for bighorn populations. BLM Manual 6511.21B states special care must be taken to insure that road and trail construction does not cause deterioration or loss of habitat, or cause physical hazard to wildlife.

See Wildlife 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.6:
No recreational facilities should be constructed in crucial bighorn summer habitat.

Support Needs:
Recreation.

Rationale:
Human activity associated with camping and picnicking sites and major interpretive sites can lead to harassment of bighorn sheep and displacement of sheep away from forage, water, and cover. Such harassment and displacement, especially in crucial summer habitat, can stress bighorn and cause a loss of habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with recreational developments in the Spring Mountains (Recreation 5.1), Virgin Mountains (Recreation 1.3), and Red Rock Canyon (Recreation 1.6). It complements HMP development in those areas (Wildlife 2.6) and ACEC proposals (Wildlife 1.37). The conflict can be serious, but resolving it at this stage with a blanket ban on all facility construction in the habitat could unnecessarily deny some important recreational developments. Activity plans are better suited to identify and solve specific resource conflicts.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Drop the recommendation.

Reason:
This question ought to be resolved at the activity plan level through the development of relevant HMPs and RAMPs.

Recommendation 1.7:
Prohibit competitive ORV use within a .5 miles of any springs, seeps, water troughs, guzzlers, or other water sources within quail and chukar crucial areas. Limit competitive ORV use to existing roads, trails, and washes, within the area from .5 miles to 1.5 miles from water sources in bird crucial areas. Limit noncompetitive ORV use (including seismic) to existing roads, trails, and washes within a .5 miles of water sources.

Support Needs:
Recreation and Minerals programs.

Rationale:
The area within 1.5 miles of water sources is considered crucial for quail and chukar particularly during summer. Distribution of these birds will correspond to the availability and location of waters. Other wildlife species, (rabbits, doves, small mammals, and nongame birds) are dependent on these waters and surrounding habitat also. The noise, soil disturbance, and vegetation (food and water) removal associated with ORV use detrimentally impacts these birds and other animals. Public demand for hunting these birds exceeds supply. In 1979, some 5,184 Clark County residents spent 25,520 days hunting quail in Clark County. An additional 1,689 Clark County residents spent 7,419 days hunting quail in other counties.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.8:
Prohibit competitive ORV use within 1.5 miles of yearlong water in mule deer habitat from May 1 to September 30. Limit competitive and noncompetitive (including seismic) ORV use to existing roads, trails, and washes throughout mule deer habitat.

Support Needs:
Recreation and Minerals programs.

Rationale:
Distribution of mule deer in Clark County is extremely limited because of lack of suitable habitat throughout most of the area. Most of the habitat involved is presently managed to prevent or limit competitive ORV use; this should be continued. Deer are limited to area 1.5 miles around water in the summer, in the desert this is the critical time of the year for deer. Deer are dependent on the vegetation (forage and cover) provided by this 1.5-mile area around water. Competitive ORV use in these areas destroys the vegetation.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.9:
Continue to prohibit competitive ORV use in the Spring Mountains. Limit noncompetitive use to existing roads and trails.

Support Needs:
Recreation program.

Rationale:
The Spring Mountains provide important habitat for many wildlife species. One of only two populations of elk in the State of Nevada, one of two populations of wild turkey in the State of Nevada, and a significant portion of the mule deer and mountain lion population in Clark County is located in the Spring Mountains. Bighorn sheep also inhabit part of the Spring Mountains. Increasing human use in the Spring Mountains is adversely affecting the wildlife populations. Allowing competitive ORV use in this area would further compound the conflicts.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.10:
Seismic exploration and competitive ORV activity should be prohibited in the washes identified on the Nongame Bird URA III Overlay. ORV activity should be prohibited in a quarter-mile wide buffer along both sides of the washes also.

Support Needs:
Recreation and Minerals program.

Rationale:
The identified washes support many more birds and other wildlife species than the surrounding open desert. Most of the washes are also important Gila monster (State-listed "rare") habitat. Studies in the Mojave and Colorado deserts in California found breeding bird densities six times higher with 15 to 45 times the total number of individuals in washes as on the open desert. Winter bird populations were 8 to 60 times higher. The particular washes identified are significant because riparian plants like desert willow, mesquite, catclaw acacia, and tamarisk are dominant vegetation that provide additional food, cover, and nesting habitat. Wildlife inhabit the edges of different habitats, the quarter-mile buffer will insure the edge created between wash habitat and open desert habitat is not subjected to the impacts of competitive ORV use.

Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) of May 24, 1977, mandates BLM to identify and protect wildlife habitat and other vital ecologically sensitive areas from disruption and to minimize vegetation removal. The Sikes Act, 1974, Section 202(C)(3)(D) provides protection for State-listed threatened or endangered species. BLM Manual 6740 recommends buffer zones along riparian zones.

See Minerals 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.11:
Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 1,918 elk AUMs of perennial forage in the allotments shown below so as to achieve reasonable numbers of elk. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support elk reasonable numbers.

TABLE WL-1.11

Big Game Area	Allotment*	Reasonable # AUM Demand
E-1	"8888"	230
	Kyle Canyon	115
	"3333"	115
	Lucky Strike	403
	Spring Mountain	153
	Wheeler Wash	902
TOTAL		1,918

*All allotments are currently ephemeral.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Clark County has one of only two populations of elk in Nevada. Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals.

BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual section 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse and burro needs. BLM Manual sections 4111.31D and 4111.32D5c state that allocations will be made to accommodate the needs of a reasonable number of wildlife animals.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.6.

Recommendation 1.12:
Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 9,400 bighorn sheep AUMs of perennial forage in current habitat (as shown in Table WL-1.12) so as to achieve reasonable numbers. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support bighorn sheep reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs. BLM Manual sections 4111.31D and 4111.32D5c state that allocations will be made to accommodate the needs of a reasonable number of wildlife animals.

In addition, the desert bighorn has been designated by BLM as a sensitive species requiring special management consideration, and public interest in this animal has resulted in the formation of the Desert Bighorn Council and the Nevada Fraternity of Desert Bighorn. This management emphasis and public interest further justifies allocating forage to this historic, big game species.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.7

TABLE WL-1.12

Big Game Area	Reasonable # AUM Demand	Allotment*
BY-1	401	McCullough
BY-2	2,040	McCullough Jean Lake Hidden Valley
BY-3	1,236	Ireteba Pks.
BY-4	502	Newberry Christmas Tree Pass
BY-5	379	Crescent Peak
BY-6	360	Spring Mtn. Table Mtn.
BY-7	1,090	Spring Mtn. Black Butte Roach Lake Table Mtn. "2222"
BY-8	1,224	"7777" Spring Mtn. Kyle Canyon
BY-9	194	"6666"
BY-10	982	Muddy Mtn. White Basin
BY-11	1,502	Muddy Mtn. White Basin
BY-12	986	Arrow Canyon Dry Lake Pittman Well Ute
BY-13	493	Billy Goat Bunkerville Hen Spr. Lime Spr.
BY-14	305	Gold Butte
BY-15	77	Upper Mormon Mesa
BY-16	307	Arrow Canyon Action Farrier
TOTAL	12,024	

* all allotments are presently ephemeral

Recommendation 1.13:

Starting with current populations in 1983, provide, by 1990, a minimum of 5,850 mule deer AUMs of perennial forage in current habitat (as shown in Table WL-1.13) so as to achieve reasonable numbers. Monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to attain the allocation required to support mule deer reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:

Range.

Rationale:

Mule deer distribution is severely restricted in Clark County. Hunter demand far exceeds allowable harvest of present populations in Clark County. Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual section 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations, but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.8.

TABLE WL-1.13

Big Game Area	Reasonable # AUM Demand	Allotment*
DY-4	150	McCullough Jean Lake
DY-2	150	Christmas Tree Pass Newberry
DY-1	4,500	"8888" Kyle Canyon "7777" "3333" Lucky Strike Spring Mtn. Table Mtn. Yount Spring Wheeler Wash
DY-5	900	Billy Goat Bunkerville Hen Spring Lime Spring Mesquite Comm.
DY-3	150	Gold Butte
Total	5,850	

* All allotments are presently ephemeral

Recommendation 1.14:

Reserve 200 lbs/acre ephemeral forage for wildlife forage and vegetation needs before licensing any to livestock.

Support Needs:

Range.

Rationale:

The importance of annuals in the diets of bighorn and tortoises has been documented as well as the competitive diet overlap between these species and livestock. Annuals are extremely important to quail, too (milkvetch, filaree). Rodents and non-game species use annuals as food sources, cover, and nesting materials. These species, in turn, are prey bases for raptors and coyotes. To maintain the habitat and provide the needs of many wildlife species, annuals should be reserved. Reservation of 200 lbs/acre was accepted in the California Desert Plan based on the professional judgement of range conservationists. BLM Manual 4111.32D5c states it is imperative that forage be reserved for wildlife for specific areas for applicable seasons of use, and not merely assigned unit-wide.

BLM Manual 4121.31A.4 states short-term leases can be issued on ephemeral range for these areas where no conflicts exist. BLM Manual 4112.11A.4a states that care must be taken that habitat requirements are met where grazing livestock use the same areas.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.9.

Recommendation 1.15:
No annual vegetation should be licensed to livestock in crucial bighorn summer habitat.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Available data indicates dietary overlap between bighorn and livestock. Annuals are used by both species. Since bighorn populations are limited by the available forage in crucial summer habitat, conflicts for annuals in these areas have the most severe impacts on bighorn. BLM Manual 4111.32D.5c states that it is imperative forage be reserved for wildlife for specific areas for applicable seasons of use and not merely assigned unit-wide. BLM Manual 4121.31A.4 states short-term leases can be issued on ephemeral range for those areas where no conflicts exist.

See Range Management 1.9 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.16:
Field examinations, including clipping and weighing, should be conducted by BLM personnel prior to ephemeral use licensing of livestock to ensure proper management and utilization of the range resource and to avoid conflicts between livestock and wildlife.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Wildlife needs for ephemeral vegetation have been identified. Big game AUM shortages, livestock concentration areas in crucial bighorn summer habitat, desert tortoise forage and cover demands, and other small wildlife forage and cover demands have been discussed. Reserving 200 pounds of annual vegetation per acre has been recommended. To meet these demands, determine total available vegetation, and ensure proper resource management and continued existence of an annual seed source, range examinations involving the clipping and weighing method should be required in every allotment prior to ephemeral licensing.

See Range Management 1.9 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.17:
Do not permit livestock grazing on the following allotments where grazing is not now allowed or has not occurred in several years:

Wheeler Slope Unallotted Area --8888
Spring Mountain Unallotted Area--4444
Rose Spring Unallotted Area --3333
Kyle Canyon --5422

Support Needs:
Range Program.

Rationale:
The listed allotments are all within the elk distribution area of the Spring Mountains. Currently, four significant grazers -- wild horses/burros, mule deer, bighorn sheep, and elk -- are utilizing the range in all or portions of the elk habitat. Livestock and elk both have preferences for grasses, particularly in the summer season. The lack of grass or meadow areas is felt to limit the elk population (75 animals) in the Spring Mountains. Livestock grazing in those unallotted areas would further decrease the amount of grasses available to elk and may result in population declines. BLM Range Manual 4112.11A4e states domestic livestock may be excluded from range used by wildlife when justified by local conditions.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.18:
Do not license livestock in the following unallotted and recently unlicensed allotments.

Newberry -- 5415
Unallotted Area -- 2222
Spring Mountain -- 4444
Unallotted Area -- 7777
Unallotted Area -- 3333
Unallotted Area -- 8888
Kyle Canyon -- 5422
Unallotted Area -- 6666
Glendale -- 2009
Muddy River -- 2017
Pittman Well -- 2019
Rox -- 2021
Sunrise Mountain -- 2022

Support Needs:
Congressional review, Range.

Rationale:
Issuing grazing licenses in these areas will create new conflicts for forage, water, and space between livestock and wildlife. All of these allotments overlap with current distributions of bighorn, elk, deer, and/or desert tortoise (in crucial tortoise habitats). Bighorn, elk, and tortoises all compete with livestock for grasses. Subsequent water developments would create accentuated, localized, severe conflicts.
43 CFR 4120.2-1(c) allows cancellation of leases to meet land use plan needs.

Section 202(e)(2) of FLPMA requires Congressional review of any management decision excluding a principal use from a tract of land 100,000 acres or larger for two or more years.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.19:
Discontinue licensing of domestic sheep in the McCullough Mountain allotment.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Domestic sheep were licensed in the McCullough Mountain allotment for the first time in 1980. Excellent, occupied bighorn habitat is located in the McCullough and Highland Ranges within the McCullough allotment. Bob McQuivey, NDOW wildlife biologist, noted the introduction of domestic sheep into the Virgin Mountains in the early part of this century may have played a major role in the demise of that range's bighorn population. Because of the conflict for forage, water, and space, and the susceptibility of bighorn to diseases of domestic sheep, domestics should not be licensed in the vicinity of occupied bighorn sheep habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

Livestock grazing in the McCullough Mountain allotment has traditionally been by cattle. Sheep were licensed for the first time in 1980. If the domestic sheep had been diseased and contact was made, severe population declines to existing bighorn herds in the McCullough and Highland ranges may have resulted.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Do not license grazing by domestic sheep in the McCullough Allotment. Allow cattle grazing.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Cattle do not present the disease problems that may threaten existing bighorn population that domestic sheep do. Cattle has been the traditional livestock class allowed in the allotment.

Alternative Considered:
Continue licensing of domestic sheep.

Recommendation 1.20:
Discontinue trailing and licensing of domestic sheep in Bunkerville and Billy Goat Peak allotments. Do not develop any new dual-use (cattle/domestic sheep) allotments in Clark County that contain current or historic bighorn habitat.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
While trailing has not occurred for many years, grazing of domestic sheep has been allowed for the last two years in Bunkerville allotment following five years of non-use. Bighorn sheep were reintroduced into their historic habitat in the Virgin Mountains in 1979 and 1980. Bob McQuivey, NDOW wildlife biologist, noted the introduction of domestic sheep into the Virgin Mountains may have played a major role in the demise of that range's bighorn population. Because of the conflict for forage, water, and space, and the susceptibility of bighorn to diseases of domestic sheep, domestics should not be licensed in the vicinity of the Virgin Mountains or in any other allotments in current or historic bighorn habitat that currently do not allow dual-use.

Multiple Use Analysis

Reintroduction of bighorn sheep into the Virgin Mountains was initiated in 1979, establishing a conflict with livestock grazing in that area.

The Bunkerville allotment covers part of the Virgin Mountains and all of Black Ridge. Domestic sheep have been grazed in the Bunkerville allotment for more than 50 years. The sheep operator has found it uneconomical to graze sheep there for the past five years. However, since the use is historical, it may be requested again in the future when the economics of sheep grazing are improved. This would engender a direct competition for forage, water, and space. An immediate concern is the susceptibility of bighorn to diseases of domestic sheep.

The trailing operation involves travel from the Arizona Strip District through the Billy Goat Peak and Bunkerville allotments to the Toquop Sheep allotment. The key area of conflict is at Government Springs in the Bunkerville allotment. The trailing route -- Gold Butte Road -- has been used since approximately 1930 and is established by agreement among the different range users.

Introductions of either bighorn sheep or domestic sheep into allotments where the other is present would immediately generate a similar conflict.

(Wildlife 1.20 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify the recommendation as follows: Resolve the domestic - bighorn sheep conflicts in the Bunkerville and Billy Goat Peak allotments through the CRMP process before the end of FY83. Do not license domestic sheep grazing until the resolution is accomplished. Continue the current trailing operation during the CRMP process. Do not develop new dual-use allotments in current or historic bighorn sheep habitat (or introduce bighorn sheep into current or historic domestic sheep allotments) until potential conflicts are identified and resolved through an HMP or AMP.

Support Needs:

CRMP, Range and Wildlife.

Reason:

Both the operators and the Department of Wildlife will most likely assert historic privileges in the Virgin Mountain area. A BLM denial of one or the other uses at this time would probably not finally resolve the issue. A CRMP effort, targeted for completion during FY83, would provide a timely response to the issue.

In general, conflicts such as this would not occur if no introduction of either bighorn or domestic sheep were made without the benefit of activity planning and the environmental analysis processes.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Requiring NDOW to keep bighorn sheep from Government Springs during trailing operations.
2. Deny bighorn sheep use west of Government Springs into the Black Ridge area.
3. Do not license domestic sheep use in Bunkerville allotment.

Recommendation 1.21:
Eliminate domestic sheep use in the Christmas Tree Pass Allotment that overlaps with historic bighorn habitat. This area includes T.30S., R.65E., Sec. 1, 2, 11, and a portion of 12; T.30S., R.66E., Sec. 5,6, and portions of 4, 7, and 8.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
The current boundary for domestic sheep grazing overlaps with historic bighorn habitat. Studies indicate domestic and bighorn sheep have similar food habits and domestics harbor diseases detrimental to bighorn, citing examples of bighorn declines following influx of diseased domestics. Bob McQuivey, NDOW wildlife biologist, noted no established populations exist in areas presently grazed by domestics in Nevada. While no bighorn are known to use the historic habitat in the domestic sheep use area, bighorn have been seen a few miles to the east. An HMP and possible reintroduction is proposed to expand bighorn into this historic habitat.

See Range Management 1.10 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.22:
Resolve potential conflicts between livestock and bighorn in historical habitat in the Newberry Mountains allotment by eliminating livestock grazing in the allotment.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
The Newberry Mountains allotment contains some excellent bighorn habitat. Due to spatial conflicts between livestock and bighorn, future bighorn populations could be displaced by livestock. Since no livestock have been licensed in this allotment for many years, terminating livestock use could benefit bighorn with no impact on livestock operators. Under 43 CFR 4120.2-1(c), livestock grazing leases can be cancelled to reach management objectives.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.23:
Prohibit livestock, wild horses, and burros access to water sources in bighorn crucial summer habitat to protect the forage for bighorn and guarantee access to water by bighorn in crucial habitat. Pipe water away from these sources presently used by livestock, horses, or burros, to points beyond bighorn habitat for livestock, horse, and burro use, only if such action does not perpetuate the conflict.

Support Needs:
Range, Wild Horse and Burro.

Rationale:
Available perennial AUMs within current crucial summer habitat do not meet reasonable number summer AUM demand. The limited AUMs allocated to bighorn should be protected. Special attention should be given to protecting forage for bighorn in these crucial summer habitats since available forage in this season is a primary limiting factor. It should be remembered that bighorn and other grazers need not be in the same area in the same season to compete. Unfortunately, sheep may be reluctant to approach water sources when cattle are nearby. As a result, livestock concentrations near water may reduce bighorn use of the water. This complements the conflict for forage due to local, intensified livestock, wild horse, and burro grazing around water sources. Overgrazing by these species can remove forage allocated to bighorn and upon which they are dependent. This recommendation will help protect and maintain crucial summer habitat and forage for bighorn.

BLM Manual 4111.32D.5c states it is imperative that forage be reserved for wildlife for specific areas for applicable seasons of use, not merely assigned unit-wide. Relocating water for horses, burros, and livestock will help protect bighorn forage.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.24:
All new fencing projects will be constructed according to applicable wildlife specifications in BLM Manual 1737. The fences listed below should receive first priority for adjustment by FY88. Other fences may be identified through HMP development.

1. Key West Seasonal Use Fence
2. Virgin Mountain Seep Spring Fence
3. Gold Butte Allotment Fence
4. Perkins Spring Fence (Sec. 1, T.19S., R.69E.)
5. Scott's Well Fence (Sec. 7, T.28S., R.61E.)
6. Mud Spring Fence (Sec.14, T.18S., R.56E.)

All proposed fence construction will be coordinated with the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Support Needs:

Division of Operations, Range, Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Rationale:
The 1979 wildlife habitat inventory for Clark County identifies at least three fences around water sources restricting wildlife access. Other fences may be restricting bighorn sheep. The proposed recommendation is consistent with BLM policies outlined in Manual 1737.

See Livestock Grazing 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.25:
Establish and enforce seasons-of-use for livestock on ephemeral-perennial allotments to ensure continuance of seed sources and the vegetation resource based on physiological and ecological factors.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
To ensure plant species and subsequent animal species diversity, the vegetation resource must be protected. Without proper rest from grazing, annuals cannot develop and drop seed and perennials cannot maintain vigor or survive. Overuse due to a lack of seasons-of-use restrictions can eliminate food sources, cover, and nesting material for small wildlife forms. BLM Manual section 4111.32C states proper seasons-of-use should be based on physiological and ecological factors as affected by local grazing practices.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.26:
Revise the Crescent Peak Allotment Management Plan (AMP) to ensure no conflicts occur with wildlife at water sources due to livestock concentrations, and to adjust the base herd in Nevada to a level equivalent to range capacity.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Crescent Peak allotment is licensed for 530 cattle yearlong. Livestock concentrations around waters important to wildlife, including bighorn, are detrimental to the forage resource and hamper use by other animals. Revision of the AMP could adjust the licensing and base herd level to protect the resource based on physiological and ecological factors and could resolve conflicts with wildlife for water. BLM Manual section 4111.31H states grazing privileges cannot exceed estimated potential grazing capacity and active grazing shall not exceed current grazing capacity.

See Livestock Grazing 1.5 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.27:
Remove wild/abandoned livestock from public land.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
Due to unintentional losses and/or poor herd management, stray livestock are roaming public lands. This is a problem especially around the yearlong waters along Bunkerville Ridge. These stray animals are competing for forage, water, and space with bighorn, mule deer, small wildlife, and licensed livestock.

Multiple Use Analysis

Wild/abandoned livestock are a constant and destructive problem on public lands. Uncontrolled, these animals compete for forage, trample and foul water sources, and damage range and wildlife projects. These animals will hamper any efforts to achieve management on the public land, and money spent to accomplish on-the-ground management could be wasted. 43 CFR 4150.2(b) says "When neither the owner of the unauthorized livestock nor his agent is known the authorized officer may proceed to impound the livestock under 4150.5." Removal of these livestock does not conflict with any other recommendation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
The Bureau is authorized to remove any unauthorized livestock from public land according to 43 CFR 4150.2(b). Removing these animals would eliminate conflicts with wildlife, wild horses and burros, and licensed livestock, and help accomplish on-the-ground management.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP I.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.28:
No new water facilities, or extension or maintenance of existing facilities, should be constructed for livestock, wild horses, or burros without development and appropriate review of an environmental assessment record (EAR) to ensure no new conflicts with bighorn for forage will be created.

Support Needs:
Range, Wild Horses & Burros, Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Present available perennial AUMs do not meet reasonable number yearlong AUM demand for bighorn except in the McCullough and Eldorado Ranges. Available perennial AUMs do not meet reasonable number summer AUM demand within current crucial summer habitat. The limited AUMs allocated to bighorn should be protected. Special attention should be given to protecting forage for bighorn in crucial summer habitat since available forage in this season is a primary limiting factor. Development of livestock waters in bighorn habitat, or within travelling distance of bighorn habitat, and the resultant intensified grazing by livestock, wild horses, and/or burros, may create new localized conflicts for existing forage that should be reserved for bighorn. This recommendation will help ensure that food resources will be maintained for bighorn as required by Section 102 of FLPMA and BLM Manual sections 4111.31A, 4111.42B3, 4112.11, and 4112.11A4c.

Multiple Use Analysis

No conflicts with this recommendation were noted except maintenance of existing projects. An environmental assessment is not required under BLM guidelines for maintenance of existing facilities. Completion of new projects, or extensions of existing ones, are required to have environmental assessments under present BLM guidelines.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
No new water facilities or extensions of existing facilities should be constructed for livestock, wild horses, or burros without development and appropriate review of an environmental assessment to assure no new conflicts are created between livestock and bighorn sheep.

Reason:
As stated in the Multiple Use Analysis above.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:
None

Recommendation 1.29

Remove all horses and burros from selected current and historic bighorn habitat. These selected areas should be managed as horse and/or burro-free areas. Burros in the Gold Butte area could jeopardize reintroduction efforts as cooperatively approved by BLM and NDOW. Selected areas are listed below:

Current habitat
Bird Spring - horses
Red Rock/LaMadre - horses
Muddy - burros
Eldorado - burros
N. McCullough - burros

Historic habitat
Gold Butte - burros

Support Needs:

Wild Horse and Burro Program, NSO Horse Capture Crews.

Rationale:

The adaptable and durable horses and burros are serious competitors for food and water. Since horses and burros are not ruminants, their digestive systems are less efficient and they must consume more forage than ruminants (i.e., bighorn) to meet nutrition and energy demands.

Overgrazing has less impact on horses than bighorn due to their ability to move long distances from water. In addition to competing for grasses, horses require 10 to 12 gallons of water per horse per day. This can be a serious limiting factor for bighorn in areas with limited water supplies (Challis Wild Horse Management Plan, BLM).

Grasses decrease and shrubs increase due to overgrazing by burros. This can create serious forage problems for bighorn. Trampling, wallowing, dusting, and rubbing activities in and around spring sources can degrade riparian zones and water quality.

Summer concentrations near water can lead to a decrease in rodent populations, overuse of vegetation, loss of quail habitat, decline in the raptor prey base, and decrease in bighorn use. Excessive burro numbers may stress lambs since both show a seasonal preference for forbs.

The adaptability of horses and burros should be considered in bighorn management. While bighorn are restricted to mountainous terrain, wild horses and burros can survive on valley floors. So, to resolve conflicts, horses and burros should be managed away from current and historic bighorn habitat.

(Wildlife 1.29 continued)

The NDOW requests that the Gold Butte area be designated a burro-free area to enhance successful reintroduction of bighorn. This recommendation deserves serious consideration since existing laws and a memorandum of understanding requires coordination of our horse and burro management with NDOW. Overgrazing of the vegetation in burro concentration areas is recognized in the Gold Butte area.

In addition, reserving forage for bighorn in Gold Butte requires management of burros in this area.

See Wild Horses and Burros 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.30:

Develop a Fire Management Plan which considers wildlife habitat needs for all ranges with bighorn sheep, mule deer, or elk populations. Efforts should be directed toward the pinyon-juniper and blackbrush vegetation types. Such a program would be particularly beneficial in the Spring Mountains (Bird Spring Range included), South McCulloughs, Virgin Mountains, and Newberry Range. The programs for these ranges should be completed by end of fiscal year 1985.

Support Needs:

Division of Operations, Fire Management.

Rationale:

Complete protection of these areas has resulted in large stands of climax plant communities that have reduced the capacity to support these big game species. Fire can be used as an effective tool to reverse this trend. Burns have been noted as preferred use areas by bighorn sheep, elk, and deer in this District. In addition, fire can be used to create interspersed habitat types, with more edge, which support higher diversities and numbers of wildlife species.

See Fire 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.31:
Develop a green firewood cutting program for the Spring, McCullough, and Virgin Mountains to improve habitat for Rocky Mountain elk, mule deer, bighorn sheep, and other wildlife species. Roads may be necessary to complete this recommendation. After cutting is completed, roads should be closed to prevent undue harassment of wildlife.

Support Needs:
Forestry program.

Rationale:
These ranges, particularly the Spring Mountain Range, have been protected from wildfire for a considerable number of years. As a result, much of the habitat is returning to climax vegetation communities. Climax communities in much of these ranges consist largely of monotypic stands of pinyon-juniper woodlands, with little or no understory vegetation. This lack of vegetation diversity limits wildlife species diversity. Initiation of a green firewood cutting program can help reverse the trend towards climax, and provide openings that create more varied habitats to support more species and numbers of wildlife.

See Forestry 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.32:
Maintain water at all spring sources. Future water projects should not be developed in such a manner that associated riparian zones are lost. Maintenance may include fencing to exclude livestock and wild horses/burros from riparian zones. (See Table WL-1.33 for prioritized lists.)

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Range, Wild Horse and Burro.

Rationale:
More than two dozen spring sources in Clark County are presently being trampled and fouled from excessive livestock or wild horse/burro use. In several instances, existing livestock water developments have eliminated water and associated riparian zones which are important wildlife habitats (see Clark County Wildlife Habitat Inventory, 1979, or Tables .46-13 and .46-14 in URA III). This is inconsistent with policy in BLM Manual 1603.12D1, D3(a), and D4(c). It is BLM policy to maintain water available at the source.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.33:
All new or existing livestock water troughs or tanks should have escape devices for birds and small animals. Escape devices should be constructed according to guidelines in BLM Technical Note 305, September 1977. All necessary escape devices should be in place on existing troughs or tanks by the end of fiscal year 1985. Future livestock waters should be designed to include escape devices and other facilities (drinkers) which will be constructed concurrently with the water development.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Approximately 70 existing troughs in Clark County (35 in each planning unit) do not have escape devices (see Clark County Wildlife Habitat Inventory 1979 or Wildlife Water Inventory Summary Table .46-13 and .46-14 URA III Clark County).

Escape devices can serve multiple functions: they allow access to water that is out of reach to small wildlife species; they prevent drowning of small wildlife species in steep-sided troughs; and they can be constructed to protect float valves that regulate water levels in troughs.

See Livestock Grazing 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE WL-1.33

Water Source*	Sec.	Township	Range	Quarter
1. Rabbit Sp. (Gov't Sp.)	15	70	9	NW
2. Seep Sp.	15	70	2	NW
3. Connolly Sp.	19	71	31	NE
4. Yellowstone Sp.	31	65	4	SE
5. Desert Queen Well	26	63	13	SW
6. Potosi Sp.	23	57	12	NW
7. Rattlesnake Sp.	16	71	28	NW
8. N. Key W. Sp.	15	71	16	SE
9. Red Rock Sp. #1-4	17	70	7,18	
10. Taylor Water Development	20	69	15	NW
11. Willow Sp.	20	69	12	
12. Twin Sp.	20	70	19	NW
13. Turkey Sp.	20	69	24	NW
14. Fairbanks Sp.	20	69	3	SE
15. Gann Sp.	20	69	15	SW
16. New Sp.	19	71	31	
17. Grapevine Sp.	19	70	34	SW
18. Scotts Well	28	61	7	NW
19. Grassy Sp.	18	58	32	SE
20. Mud Sp.	18	56	15	SE
21. Bullion Sp.	28	60	20	SE
22. Cottonwood Sp.	31	65	28	SE
23. Mud Sp. #2	22	58	15	SE
24. Mule Sp.	22	57	15	SW
25. Sheep Sp.	20	57	36	SW
26. Buck Sp.	18	55	35	SW

*Priorities may change through the HMP process.

Recommendation 1.34:
Construct wildlife drinkers where needed. Wildlife drinkers should be provided along any present or future livestock water pipelines or developments.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Range Management Program.

Rationale:
Water is the primary limiting factor for wildlife in Clark County. At least 20 (13 in Stateline and 7 in Virgin Valley PU) drinkers alone are needed to allow access by large mammals to existing waters that are surrounded by corrals. Some wildlife species, particularly big game like bighorn sheep and deer, are intimidated by corrals and will not drink at waters surrounded by them. Oftentimes the location of livestock watering facilities is not in adequate cover for many wildlife species. Using a small portion of the water supplied by livestock water developments, wildlife drinkers can be placed in more suitable cover or terrain that will promote maximum utilization by wildlife. Because of these factors, where feasible, separate watering opportunities for wildlife should be provided in association with other water developments.

See Wildlife 1.35 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.35:
Develop wildlife waters where deemed feasible. See Clark County Wildlife Habitat Inventory for possible locations.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, NDOW.

Rationale:
Water is the primary limiting factor for wildlife in Clark County. Approximately 48 and 10 ephemeral waters in the Stateline and Virgin Valley Planning Units respectively, were identified in the Clark County Wildlife Habitat Inventory as having potential to be developed as yearlong waters. Ephemeral waters usually dry up when water is needed by wildlife the most. Insuring yearlong water can increase wildlife populations and diversity. The potential to expand use by big game in all ranges is possible with development of more yearlong waters.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Livestock Grazing 2.2, Wild Horses and Burros 1.4 and 2.4, Watershed 3.1, and Wildlife 1.23, 1.32, and 1.34)

In the desert environment water is the key limiting factor for achieving proper management of resources. By developing and protecting water sources, yearlong water can be made available for wildlife and livestock. Providing water when it is needed most can increase wildlife populations, improve livestock distribution, reduce conflicts between livestock and wildlife, and improve the range resource.

Water sources are being contaminated and degraded by trampling and fouling from livestock and wild horses and burros. Fencing water sources and making water available by piping water to troughs (Watershed 3.1) will enable a water source to be used on a yearlong basis for the benefit of multiple use management. The use of pipelines to disperse water will improve livestock distribution, reduce conflicts with wildlife, livestock, wild horses and burros, and make water available to wild horses and burros, and livestock on a more dependable basis (Livestock Grazing 2.2 and Wild Horses and Burros 1.4). With the demand for water in the desert, development of new water sources is very important; however, care must be taken to insure that water sources and riparian zones are protected, new conflicts for forage and habitats are not created, and water is made available for multiple uses (Wildlife 1.34 and 1.32, and Livestock Grazing 2.2).

(Wildlife 1.35 continued)

Some water sources are used by livestock, wildlife, and wild horses and burros in areas where forage competition exists (Wildlife 1.23). Continued use of the waters by all animals would continue the present competition.

Many water sources, both natural and man-made, serve wild horse and burro areas. This creates forage competition, which the vegetation resource may or may not be able to sustain. While livestock are removable from ranges, particularly ephemeral ranges, horses and burros are year-round grazers. New waters, available to horses and burros outside of existing herd areas, could create new or intensify existing competition for forage, with potential detriment to wildlife or the forage resource.

A further consideration with respect to water developments is long-term maintenance. Non-maintenance of projects would ultimately lead to the loss of the waters, the investment, and the benefit provided the resource by the project (Wildlife 1.36).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Provide water for wildlife, wild horses and burros, and livestock use on public land throughout Clark County. Existing waters should be maintained at the source and actions taken (such as fencing) by 1990 to exclude livestock and wild horses and burros from degrading the source or associated riparian areas (see Tables WL-1.33 and LG-2.2). Where livestock or wild horses and burros now use the waters, use must be provided away from the protected areas. Existing forage use by any animal should not be denied by denying water access until habitat/allotment use levels are determined after CRMP and monitoring. New waters can be developed (by BLM, NDOW, or ranchers), but such developments must not create new competition for forage or habitat among wildlife, livestock, or wild horses and burros. Wildlife drinkers

Reason:
Water, in the desert, is the key limiting factor to all animals. There are existing competitions for water and forage which must be resolved through the monitoring and CRMP processes. BLM can, however, avoid new conflicts by judicious development of waters throughout the county. Many direct water use conflicts between animals and between animals and water values themselves, can be resolved by fencing water sources and riparian areas and providing use to some animals outside the exclosure.

(Wildlife 1.35 continued)

should be routinely provided on all projects, unless new conflicts are created thereby. Do not develop new waters which have the sole purpose of expanding wild horse and burro areas or periods-of-use.

On all new water developments permitted by BLM, and on all waters in which BLM has an interest, wildlife use should be made available to wildlife on a year-round basis.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Denying current water use to some classes of animals.
2. Allowing expansion of wild horse and burro habitat through water developments.
3. Do not protect water sources and riparian areas.

Recommendation 1.36:
Routinely visit and maintain wildlife projects in Clark County.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
Wildlife projects such as guzzlers, bird/small mammal ladders, catchments, vegetation manipulations, etc., increase the availability of resources upon which wildlife populations become dependent. To ensure the survival of dependent populations, determine the need for new projects, and protect the initial investment, these projects should be maintained.

See Livestock Grazing 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.37:
Manage bighorn summer habitat, lambing habitat, and migration routes as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Top priority should be given to the following ranges in the order listed: Arrow Canyon, McCullough, Highland, Red Rock/LaMadre, Muddy, Bird Spring, Eldorado, Virgin Mountains, and New York/Castle/Piute.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
FLPMA authorizes the designation and protection of ACECs through the planning process. ACECs include areas requiring special attention to protect endangered, threatened, or sensitive fish and wildlife species, or habitat components needed to maintain and perpetuate their populations. The MX program, oil and gas exploration and development, and increased recreational (ORV) pressures necessitate special efforts to safeguard this species and its habitat components.

See Forestry 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.38:
Apply the management decisions applicable to current yearlong, winter, and crucial bighorn habitats to habitats created by HMP development, or population expansion and/or to habitat identified through field data updating.

Support Needs:
All related resource activities.

Rationale:
As new habitat becomes occupied by bighorn as intended under Wildlife Objective 2.0, the same rationales, policies, and mandates apply to these areas as applied to current bighorn habitats.

See Range Management 1.10 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.39:
Allow no new mineral leases on public land adjacent to the Virgin River and Moapa (Muddy) River. Oil and gas development and new sand and gravel operations should be prohibited on public land adjacent to these rivers. These prohibitions should remain in effect until detailed environmental analyses or habitat management plans are completed which would analyze the effects of oil and gas leasing or sand and gravel operations on these rivers.

Support Needs:
Minerals.

Rationale:
The Virgin River from the Nevada-Arizona border to Lake Mead has been designated critical habitat for the endangered Woundfin (*Plagopterus argentissimus*). Several other species of native fish are found in this river. The headwaters of the Moapa (Muddy) River are critical habitat for the endangered Moapa Dace (*Moapa coriacea*). Several other species of native fish are also found in the Moapa River. These prohibitions are consistent with the Bureau's responsibilities regarding endangered species as outlined in the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and its amendments. These restrictions could be increased or eliminated depending on the analyses made in the EAs or HMPs.

See Minerals 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 2.0:
Return native fauna to historic ranges and/or improve population numbers in current use areas through effective habitat management in cooperation with State or other Federal wildlife agencies. Increase species diversity and distribution of desired animals throughout the variety of habitat types in Clark County with special emphasis on Federal- and State-classified or BLM-identified sensitive species.

Rationale:
Bureau of Land Management policy is "to maintain a maximum diversity of wildlife species in sufficient numbers to meet public demands" (BLM Manual Section 1603.12D3(a)). It is anticipated that public demand for hunting, fishing, and general wildlife viewing experiences will continue to rise. To meet future demand for wildlife-related experiences, habitat expansion by animal species is necessary, not only for consumptive/nonconsumptive uses, but also for sustaining viable animal populations. The following legislation and policies provide the authority and mandates to accomplish the above objective.

A. National Environmental Policy Act
B. Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 as amended
C. Public Land Administration Act of 1960
D. Endangered Species Act of 1973
E. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968
F. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976
G. Sikes Act 1974, Title II
H. Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality
I. Federal Regulations regarding cooperation with State for the preservation use and management of fish and wildlife resources (43 CFR 24)
J. Departmental Policy established and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in August of 1966
K. BLM Instruction Memorandum 80-225, 1980

Multiple Use Analysis

Increasing both numbers and ranges of wildlife species will serve to bolster the overall character of the Southern Nevada natural environment. It is important to note that current and historic habitats, or animal populations, were modified in the past as a result of resource-use decisions made by man. It is entirely possible that these same conflicts still exist and must be resolved prior to introductions or population increases.

(Wildlife 2.0 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written with the addition of the following: Assure resource use conflicts are resolved prior to reintroduction to historic ranges or population increases.

Recommendation 2.1:
Develop a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the Moapa (Muddy) River from the head-springs to Lake Mead.

All public land immediately adjacent to the Moapa River should be retained in public ownership until completion of the proposed HMP and a disposition recommended.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Cultural Resources.

Rationale:
Habitat Management Plans are the Wildlife Activity Plan component of the Bureau Planning System and the action program phase of the Bureau Wildlife Habitat Management System. The Moapa River contains habitat for two species of native fish where it traverses public land. These species are the Moapa River Speckled Dace (*Rhinichthys osculus moapae*) and the Moapa River Roundtail (*Gila robusta* ssp.). The Moapa River Speckled Dace has been classified threatened by the American Fisheries Society (AFS) Endangered Species Committee. Also, the Moapa River has an overall rating as a "highest valued fishery resource" based on the Nevada Stream Evaluation Criteria Matrix. Completion of an HMP would be consistent with BLM policy in compliance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, May 24, 1977.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.2:

Develop a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the Virgin River from the Arizona-Nevada border to Lake Mead. The HMP should be consistent with the Woundfin Recovery Plan. The priority species for the HMP should be the Woundfin (*Plagopterus argentissimus*). The HMP should also address the habitat of other fishes as well as waterfowl, upland game, and nongame bird habitat. The Virgin River is a candidate for designation as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern. All public land within the Virgin River floodplain should be retained in public ownership.

Support Needs:

Division of Operations, Cultural Resources.

Rationale:

Habitat Management Plans are the Wildlife Activity Plan component of the Bureau Planning System and the action program phase of the Bureau Wildlife Habitat Management System. The development of an HMP is an objective of the approved Woundfin Recovery Plan and is consistent with the Bureau's responsibilities regarding endangered species as outlined in the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and its amendments.

The Virgin River is one of the few continuous riparian areas with significant public land along it in Clark County. Through an HMP, the potential to improve the value of this area for many wildlife species would be greatly increased. Completion of an HMP would be in compliance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, May 24, 1977.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.3:
Develop a Habitat Management Plan for the Cold Creek-Willow Creek area.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Programs.

Rationale:
Habitat Management Plans are the Wildlife Activity Plan component of the Bureau Planning System and the action program phase of the Bureau Wildlife Habitat Management System. Willow Creek is the only coldwater fishery resource in Clark County. According to the Nevada Stream Evaluation Criteria Matrix, Cold Creek has an overall rating as a "limited fishery resource" and Willow Creek has an overall rating as a "highest valued fishery resource."

The Cold Creek-Willow Creek area contains riparian habitat, which is very limited in Clark County. Human use has caused major adverse impacts at Cold Creek and Willow Creek, including destruction of streamside vegetation. This vegetation provides cover for fish and prevents the sun from warming the coldwater streams. The vegetation also provides habitat for many birds and small mammals. An HMP can help resolve these conflicts.

Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, of May 24, 1977, mandates BLM to reestablish damaged floodplain ecosystems, including streamside habitat, through project work and/or restriction, improved management, or elimination of uses creating the problem.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.4:
Work with Nevada Department of Wildlife to reintroduce desert bighorn into historic habitat. Allow extension of bighorn distribution into historic habitat where reintroductions are not necessary.

Support Needs:
Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Rationale:
In 1978, the BLM and NDOW cooperatively developed an action plan to maintain bighorn distributions in current habitat and expand bighorn distributions into historic habitat. Reintroduction sites were proposed in several ranges in Clark County. Releases may be needed in the McCullough, Bird Spring, north Spring Mountain, North Muddy, Sunrise, Dry Lake, and Newberry Ranges. Other areas may receive new or increased use through habitat management.

Reestablished populations would add to the potential for hunting and high quality sightseeing opportunities. A BLM-NDOW cooperative agreement requires BLM to cooperate with NDOW in transplant programs. NDOW input into Clark County planning recommends reintroducing bighorn into all suitable habitat.

Recommendation changed to Range Mangement 1.10.

Recommendation 2.5:

As reintroduction or habitat expansion of bighorn sheep occurs into historic habitat, provide, at a minimum, the bighorn sheep perennial forage identified in Table WL-2.5 so as to achieve reasonable numbers of the animal. Along with reintroduction or habitat expansion, monitor forage utilization by all ungulate species and adjust numbers of competitive animals as necessary to obtain the allocation required to support bighorn sheep reasonable numbers.

Support Needs:

Range.

Rationale:

Section 102 of FLPMA (P.L. 94-579) requires BLM to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. BLM Manual section 4111.31A requires consideration of wildlife demands before determining the amount of forage available to livestock. BLM Manual 4730.3 authorizes reducing livestock allocations but not wildlife allocations, to meet horse/burro needs.

BLM and NDOW have cooperatively identified the opportunity to expand bighorn into all historic habitat.

In addition, the desert bighorn has been designated by BLM as a sensitive species requiring special management consideration. Public interest in this animal has resulted in the formation of the Desert Bighorn Council and the Nevada Fraternity of Desert Bighorn. This management emphasis and public interest further justifies allocating forage to this historic, big game species.

Recommendation changed to Range Management 1.11.

TABLE WL-2.5

Big Game Area	Projected AUM Demand	Allotment*
BPY-2	562	Hidden Valley
		Jean Lake
BPY-3	206	Ireteba Pks.
BPY-4	672	Newberry
		South Pt.
		Christmas Tree
		Ireteba Pk.
BPY-5	53	Crescent Pk.
BPY-6	384	"4444"
BPY-7	362	"4444"
		Black Butte
		Table Mtn.
BPY-8	4,190	"4444"
		Younts Sp.
		"3333"
		Wheeler Wash
		"8888"
		Lucky Strike
BPY-11	552	Upper Muddy Mtn.
		Glendale
		Muddy R.
		Muddy Mtn.
		White Basin
BPY-12	38	Dry Lake
		Pittman Well
BPY-2	562	Hidden Valley
		Jean Lake
BPY-13	874	Billy Goat
		Bunkerville
		Hen Spring
		Lime Spring
		Mesquite Comm.
BPY-14	2,172	Azure Ridge
		Gold Butte
		"9999"
BPY-17	290	Sunrise
BPY-18	485	Muddy Mtn.
		Dry Lake
TOTAL	10,840	

* All allotments are ephemeral at present

Recommendation 2.6:
Develop and/or implement HMPs in these bighorn areas. Priority should be given to areas with severe conflicts.

Severe conflict areas:
Arrow Canyon Range
McCullough Range
Gold Butte Range

Other bighorn areas:
Highland
Eldorado
Newberry
New York-Castle
Bird Spring
South Spring
Red Rock
North Spring
Muddies
Sunrise
Dry Lake
Virgin Mountains

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
HMP development and implementation is an effective means of attaining management objectives and is authorized by BLM policy. HMPs allow special management consideration for sensitive species like bighorn as required. Policy, mandates, and authority include the Sikes Act, Sec. 201, and BLM Manual 6620.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.7:
Develop a Habitat Management Plan to resolve conflicts and benefit the elk population in the Spring Mountains. The HMP should be written by 1985, with on-the-ground projects completed within five years thereafter. Other wildlife needs, including mule deer, bighorn sheep, and wild turkey, should be addressed also.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations; Wild Horse/Burro, Recreation, Forestry, and Range programs.

Rationale:
More intensive management is needed to expand the present elk population (75 animals) to Nevada Department of Wildlife reasonable numbers or goal levels (200 animals). Lack of grass or meadow-like summer habitat, increasing human disturbance, and competition with wild horses and burros limit the present elk population. A comprehensive management plan identifying projects or other management actions needed to resolve conflicts would best facilitate intensive management. The projects associated with an HMP can benefit other wildlife species as well.

Policy, mandates, and authority include the Sikes Act, Sec. 201, and BLM Manual 6620.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Objective 3.0:
Provide special management consideration on public lands within Clark County to protect and increase current populations of desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizi).

Rationale:
The desert tortoise is Federally-listed as threatened in Utah, State-listed as rare in Nevada, and classified by BLM as a sensitive species. Currently, its status in California, Arizona, and Nevada is being reviewed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for possible classification as a threatened species throughout its range in these states.

The Sikes Act of 1974, Section 202(c)(3)(D), provides protection for State-listed rare or threatened species.

The BLM Nevada State Director and the Director of the Nevada Department of Wildlife have agreed to list the desert tortoise as a BLM sensitive species. Accordingly, BLM is required to give the desert tortoise special management consideration in order to prevent the species from deteriorating to the point of becoming Federally-listed.

On August 20, 1980, the desert tortoise and its respective critical habitat on the Beaver Dam Slope Area were listed as threatened in Utah. Currently (1981) the desert tortoise and its respective critical habitats are being considered for proposed listing as a threatened species in Arizona, California, and Nevada. The Endangered Species Act does not require the BLM to initiate a "Section 7" consultation with the USFWS in regards to projects or activities which may affect proposed endangered or threatened species. However, in order to avoid later conflicts under Section 7, it is highly recommended and considered to be in the best interests of both the species and the BLM to initiate a voluntary and informal consultation with the USFWS. Furthermore, under Section 7, BLM is mandated to utilize its authorities to carry out an affirmative beneficial conservation program for listed species, and is prohibited from jeopardizing continued existence of those species or adversely modifying or destroying their critical habitat. Importantly, it is in the best interest of the BLM to initiate such programs because, if successful, they could lead to revision of the original USFWS biological opinion or delisting of critical habitat, thereby allowing for completion of the proposed projects or activity without violation of Section 7. Finally, under Section 7, BLM is required to consider not only the impacts of the particular project or activity on which consultation is being conducted, but also the cumulative effects of all activities or programs which may have similar impacts on a listed species or its habitat. In other words, consultation is not a piecemeal analysis of the impacts of individual projects or activities on endangered species and their habitats.

(Wildlife 3.0 continued)

Multiple Use Analysis

The desert tortoise has been strongly impacted in Southern Nevada by the activities of man. Placing the Clark County population of desert tortoise on either the Federal threatened or endangered lists would severely impact all of BLM's local resource management programs. The use restriction inherent in those new directions would severely strain the District's working relationships with its publics. Special management considerations employed now may offset more stringent requirements in the future.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 3.1:
Restrict oil and gas exploration, especially seismic activity using vehicles or explosives, in identified crucial tortoise habitat to existing roads, trails, and washes. Limit exploration to the time of the year when the tortoise is in hibernation, October through February. See Distribution of Desert Tortoise and Oil and Gas Leases in Desert Tortoise Habitat URA III Overlays.

Support Needs:
Minerals program.

Rationale:
In the Virgin Valley Planning Unit, 85 miles of oil and gas seismic lines traverse 493 square miles of crucial desert tortoise habitat. Off-road vehicle travel or other activities by seismic crews impact desert tortoise by killing or maiming, collapsing burrows, and destroying vegetation which provides food and cover. These impacts would be minimized if the recommendation is enforced. 43 CFR 8364.1 authorizes temporary closures.

See Minerals 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.2:
Limit oil, gas, and geothermal development within crucial desert tortoise habitat by enforcing the following six protective measures:

1. Limit the size of the area disturbed during drilling operations to only the minimum necessary to do the job.

2. Where feasible, limit access to drill sites to existing roads and trails.

3. Limit drilling to the time of the year when the tortoise is in hibernation (October through February).

4. After well abandonment, access roads created for use during drilling will be rendered unaccessible to motorized vehicles.

5. As soon as is feasible all areas denuded (access roads, drill sites) will be seeded with native shrubs, grasses, and forbs, or any other measures that may be needed to successfully reclaim the areas.

6. Coordination with District wildlife personnel will be made prior to initiation of any development activity.

Support Needs:
Minerals program.

Rationale:
Thirty-nine percent (104 square miles) and 83 percent (408 square miles) of the desert tortoise crucial habitat in the Stateline and Virgin Valley Planning Units, respectively, already have oil and gas leases issued. Development in these areas would impact desert tortoise in the following ways: habitat and animals could be lost from construction of new roads, drill pads and sumps; increased collecting and killing of tortoises from additional access provided by roads and resultant increased vehicle use. Such impacts could be minimized if the protective measures are instituted.

See Minerals 1.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.3:
Discourage the development of new roads and trails in crucial desert tortoise habitat. See Distribution of Desert Tortoise URA III Overlay for locations of crucial habitat.

Support Needs:
All programs.

Rationale:
A 1978 study showed that within a kilometer (.58 miles) of paved roads, desert tortoise populations are detrimentally impacted. Similar impacts occur on dirt roads depending on traffic volume. There are 1.41 miles and .83 miles of roads and trails per square mile of crucial habitat already existing in the Stateline and Virgin Valley Planning Units, respectively. Additional intrusions may result in significant population reductions from loss of animals by vehicular collision, passerby collection, and loss of habitat and animals from road construction. BLM Manual 6511.21B states that special care must be taken to insure that road and trail construction does not cause deterioration or loss of wildlife habitat or cause physical hazards to wildlife.

See Wildlife 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.4:
Prohibit competitive ORV use in crucial desert tortoise habitat. Limit competitive ORV use in non-crucial tortoise habitat to existing roads and designated trails and washes. Limit competitive use in non-crucial areas to the time of the year when the tortoise is in hibernation, October through February. See Distribution of Desert Tortoise and 1975 ORV Use Classifications in Desert Tortoise Habitat URA III Overlays.

Support Needs:
Recreation program.

Rationale:
Approximately 40 percent (311 square miles) of the crucial tortoise habitat in Clark County is presently managed as open to unrestricted ORV use. Limiting competitive use in non-crucial areas would minimize further habitat degradation into the crucial category, thus requiring stronger restrictions on use. Unrestricted ORV use has been well documented as being especially detrimental to desert tortoise populations. Enforcement of the recommendation would minimize the impacts to desert tortoise.

See Recreation 6.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 3.5:
Eliminate livestock (cattle and domestic sheep) grazing during March through May in crucial desert tortoise habitat. Table WL-3.5 shows the affected allotments in each Crucial Desert Tortoise Area.

Support Needs:
Range.

Rationale:
A two-year study on the Beaver Dam Slope of Arizona showed a 40 percent dietary overlap between cattle and tortoises for annual forbs and grasses in a poor rainfall year and as high as 80 percent in a good rainfall year. Even though dietary overlap in dry years is lower, the competition between tortoises and cattle may be more intense than indicated by the index of dietary overlap. Spring annual forbs and grasses contain the essential nutrients necessary to sustain reproduction (egg production, etc.). Reproduction may be suppressed when these spring annual forbs and grasses are nonexistent or present in insufficient quantity. If suppressed reproduction continues for two or more years, the tortoise population, which naturally has a low recruitment and a long maturation period, could be adversely affected, in the long run to the point of extinction, by insufficient reproduction.

BLM Manual 4111.31A states that the availability of land for grazing use, and the amount of forage available for use by livestock, will be determined after giving consideration to wildlife demands. BLM Manual 4112.11A4e states that, when justified by local conditions, livestock can be excluded during any season from wildlife range. BLM Manual 4121.31A.4 states that on ephemeral ranges short-term leases will be issued for those areas where no conflicts exist.

See Range Management 1.9 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

TABLE WL-3.5

Desert Tortoise Crucial Area	Allotment	Livestock Class*	Acreage Tortoise Habitat
C-DT-1	Arrow Canyon	C	25,616
	Acton-Farrier	C	39,565
	Rox	C	2,173
	Glendale	C	22,353
	Upper Mormon Mesa	C,H	46,494
Total Acreage Crucial Area			136,201
C-DT-2	Pittman Well	C	22,208
	Dry Lake	C	19,120
Total Acreage Crucial Area			41,328
C-DT-3	Muddy Mtn.	C,H	48,132
C-DT-4	Bunkerville	C,H,S	3,661
C-DT-5	Bunkerville	C,H,S	24,747
	Gold Butte	C	9,546
	Billy Goat Peak	C	16,981
Total Acreage Crucial Area			51,274
C-DT-6	Gold Butte	C	18,253
C-DT-7	Spring Mtn.	No use	32,595
C-DT-8	Table Mtn.	C	9,633
C-DT-9	Jean Lake	C	4,117
C-DT-10	McCullough Mtn.	C,S	6,853
C-DT-11	Crescent Pk.	C	31,077
	Ireteba Pk.	C	27,762
	Christmas Tree	C,S	46,149
	Newberry	No use	5,440
Total Acreage Crucial Area			110,428

* Class of livestock
C = Cattle
H = Domestic Horse
S = Domestic Sheep

Recommendation 3.6:
In crucial desert tortoise habitat, eliminate domestic sheep grazing of the same use areas two years in succession and limit them to a single pass through any given use area in any one grazing season. Table WL-3.6 shows the affected allotments in each Crucial Desert Tortoise Area.

Support Needs:
Range program.

Rationale:
A 1978 study in the western Mojave Desert showed that impacts to desert tortoise habitat from sheep grazing are particularly severe. In one pass through an area, sheep removed 60 percent of annuals in the coppice mounds of creosote bushes and trampled 24 to 28 percent of the annuals in the intershrub areas. In areas where sheep graze frequently, bedding or water sites, the reduction in annuals was much more severe. Sheep also reduced the cover of perennial shrubs of such species as burrobush and spiny hopsage by 16 to 19, and 29 percent, respectively.

BLM Manual 4111.31A states that the availability of land for grazing use, and the amount of forage available for use by livestock will be determined after giving consideration to wildlife demands.

BLM Manual 4112.11A4e states that when justified by local conditions, livestock can be excluded during any season from wildlife range. BLM Manual 4121.31A.4 states that on ephemeral ranges short-term leases will be issued for those areas where no conflicts exist.

Multiple Use Analysis

Eliminating domestic sheep grazing in the same use area two years in a row would limit livestock grazing operations, particularly in years of good ephemeral production. On the other hand, making more than one pass in a given season would severely limit availability of ephemeral forage in that area to wildlife.

(Wildlife 3.6 continued)

Conflicts involving trailing and domestic-bighorn sheep use in the Bunkerville, Gold Butte, and Billy Goat Peak allotments will be addressed through the CRMP process prior to FY83 (Wildlife 1.20). This use conflict could also be addressed at that time. The same is true of the Christmas Tree Pass allotment (Wildlife 1.21). Sheep use is to be eliminated from the McCullough Mountain (Wildlife 1.19) and Newberry Mountain allotments (Wildlife 1.22).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
In desert tortoise crucial habitat, limit domestic sheep to a single pass through any use area in any one grazing season. Inspect sheep use areas annually to determine if perennial forage species are being unduly impacted. Adjust use as necessary. Resolve sheep-desert tortoise conflicts on Bunkerville, Gold Butte, Billy Goat Peak, and Christmas Tree allotments during the CRMP process.

Reason:
The multiple use recommendation protects crucial tortoise habitat but still allows domestic sheep grazing in consecutive high ephemeral forage production years.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None.

TABLE WL-3.6

Desert Tortoise Crucial Area	Allotment	Acreage Crucial Tortoise Habitat
C-DT-4	Bunkerville	3,661
C-DT-5	Bunkerville	24,747
	Gold Butte	9,546
	Billy Goat Peak	16,981
Total Acreage Crucial Area		51,274
C-DT-10	McCullough Mtn.	6,853
C-DT-11	Crescent Peak	31,077
	Ireteba Peaks	27,762
	Christmas Tree	46,149
	Newberry	5,440
Total Acreage Crucial Area		110,428

Recommendation 3.7:

Develop and implement HMPs in the following sequence for the following Desert Tortoise Crucial Areas. Areas with (*) should be identified as ACEC.

C-DT-5	Virgin Mountain*
C-DT-11	Piute Valley*
C-DT-8	Goodsprings*
C-DT-1	Moapa*
C-DT-2	Arrow Canyon*
C-DT-3	California Wash*
C-DT-9	Sheep Mountain
C-DT-10	Eldorado Valley
C-DT-6	Horse Spring Wash
C-DT-4	Riverside
C-DT-7	Redrock

Support Needs:

Division of Operations, All activities.

Rationale:

Preparation and implementation of HMPs is consistent with Bureau policy.

An ACEC is an area "within the public lands where special management attention is required (when such areas are developed or used or where no development is required) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards" (Sec. 103(a), FLPMA).

Only six of the 11 desert tortoise crucial areas are being recommended to be identified as ACECs. These six areas are large enough to protect and intensively manage the desert tortoise populations within.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 1.0:
Manage all formally designated recreation lands and natural areas in Clark County to prevent or minimize degradation of the resource values for which the areas were set aside. Designate any additional areas found to be worthy through study or inventory, by the Bureau of Land Management or cooperating agencies. Provide compatible recreation opportunities where desirable or feasible, and enhance management of the areas through public education and interpretation to improve recreation opportunities.

Rationale:
Numerous areas in the county have received special designations and must be managed accordingly. The Code of Federal Regulations, 43 CFR 6200.0-6, indicates that lands with significant natural values may be designated and segregated. The BLM Manual 1603.12C2c acknowledges the BLM's role in environmental protection and specifically discusses the preservation and protection of national values.

Some deterioration of these values has occurred up to this time. These areas should be managed so as to provide continued public use in a manner that assures maintenance of the quality of the site. Preservation of areas for scientific and educational use is also important.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective conforms with Bureau policy and the requirements of the various designation orders. It is important that unqualified areas not be continued or designated so as not to cheapen the really valuable areas. It is equally important to facilitate designation processes to avoid eliminating other multiple uses while awaiting a decision on an area.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:
Protect and manage the following Natural Areas for their scenic, scientific, botanical, geologic, and educational values. Develop an information base on the Natural Areas for use in interpretive efforts and to gain a better understanding of the ecology of the areas. Develop and implement a Recreation Resource Monitoring System to provide protection through use supervision and to monitor the condition of the recreation-related natural resources present.

a) Pine Creek Research Natural Area
b) Desert View Natural Environmental Area

Support Needs:
All Divisions of Las Vegas District Office.

Rationale:
According to 43 CFR 8223, Management of Natural Areas, use should be limited to the extent necessary to preserve scientific and educational values. In addition, under 43 CFR 2071.1, a natural environmental area also includes a "natural setting suitable for recreation... usually in combination with other uses." Protection of these areas in their existing condition will insure the continued values of these areas for the aforementioned reasons.

Multiple Use Analysis

No conflicts were identified.

The Pine Creek Research Natural Area is located within Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands and the Desert View Natural Environmental Area is located along the Lee Canyon Road. Their designation as Natural Areas, as per the CFR, necessitates managing the areas as recommended.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
The nature of the values in and the location of these areas require intense management of the type that will allow for optimum recreational and research use while maintaining the integrity of natural area values.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.2:
Remove the "Outstanding Natural Area" status from Sunrise Mountain and redesignate it as a "recreation lands," recognizing its potential for intensive recreation use in the long-term future. Prepare a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) in 1985 with the possibility of adjusting the existing boundaries to include Rainbow Gardens. In the interim, manage both areas as a single unit.

Support Needs:
District Recreation staff; assistance from the Lands staff; Federal Register notification.

Rationale:
Lack of supporting data as well as current conditions make the continued designation of 10,240 acres in the vicinity of Sunrise Mountain as a "Natural Area" questionable. Calling the area "Natural" has subjected the BLM to ridicule, and cheapens the effect of the designation when used elsewhere.

However, Sunrise and the area to the south, Rainbow Gardens, do contain excellent geological sightseeing features, several semi-developed trails, and some desert botanical values. The area is currently receiving intensive recreational use and as the population of Las Vegas becomes more urbanized, the value of this area for an urban or regional park will steadily increase. This idea of an urban park is currently a key concept of the Clark County Wetlands Master Plan. A vital step to initiate this plan is the acquisition of land use through an R&PP lease from the BLM.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Sunrise Mountain Natural Area is located on the fringes of the Las Vegas City limits. Its outstanding features are primarily geological, with some botanical features noted. Due to the area's proximity to Las Vegas and ready accessibility, its current use is intense and involves off-roading and target shooting. Utility powerlines traverse the area. Much of the area, primarily along Lake Mead Boulevard, is unsightly due to illegal dumping. To adequately manage the area as "natural" would require intense management that would prove to be too costly, particularly at the expense of other high priority areas.

(Recreation 1.2 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify recommendation to read as follows: Remove the "outstanding natural area" designation for Sunrise Mountain and have these lands fall into the multiple-use management category with an emphasis on recreation use. Recognizing existing and future intensive recreation use, prepare, by 1985, a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) for the area, adjusting the boundary for the RAMP as research/needs dictate. The RAMP will be considered and coordinated with other resource activity plans on the area.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
The Sunrise/Frenchman Mountain area's existing use is recreational in nature. None the less, the area's proximity to a rapidly growing major metropolitan area necessitates that the BLM consider all resources available and manage these lands for their multiple-use resource potential. To manage this area as "natural" would require intense management similar to that at RRCRL and, at this point in time, this is an unreasonable requirement.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Continue present management.
2. Manage as "recreation land."

Recommendation 1.3:

Protect and manage the Virgin Mountain Natural Area, which encompasses features representative of three major North American desert life zones, for its scientific values. Develop an information base on the Natural Area for use in interpretive efforts and to gain a better understanding of the ecology of the area. Develop and implement a Resource Monitoring System to provide protection through use supervision and to monitor the condition of the recreation-related natural resources present. Manage the contiguous acreage, including Whitney Pockets, which has archeological and geological values worthy of preserving, and the Natural Area as a single unit. Prepare an RAMP on this area during fiscal years 1987 to 1992.

Support Needs:

District Recreational staff, and all supporting District personnel as needed.

Rationale:

The Virgin Mountain National Area was designated for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems where three desert life zones overlap. The Virgin Mountains (including the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets) were identified during the wilderness inventory as a prime recreation area with superlative resource values, by a number of user groups. Interest in retaining these values is extremely high. Use in either area is not expected to increase dramatically in the foreseeable future (2-5 years), but with the rapid growth Southern Nevada is undergoing, use patterns could change very rapidly.

Multiple Use Analysis

No conflicts were identified.

The Virgin Mountain Natural Area encompasses most of the higher elevations of the Virgin Mountains. Access to the area is fair. There is a potential for indiscriminate resource use. Whitney Pockets is a highly valued archeological area currently used for recreational purposes. There is the potential for further degradation of the archaeological site. The area between the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets is mountainous and its existing use involves primarily livestock grazing and recreation. Residents of Mesquite view the Virgin Mountain area as an important recreation area.

(Recreation 1.3 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the recommendation as follows: Protect and manage the Virgin Mountain Natural Area as per guidelines contained in the CFR and manage Whitney Pockets for its recreation and archaeological use and potential. In essence, manage both units as a single unit, but the contiguous area between the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets is not included as part of the management unit. Develop an information base on the Natural Area and Whitney Pockets, and develop and implement a resource monitoring and visitor service system. If use warrants, prepare an RAMP on the area between FY87 and FY92. Coordinate the RAMP with other activity plans.

Reason:
The Virgin Mountain Natural Area and Whitney Pockets are recognized as having significant recreational and archaeological values. They are susceptible to resource damage. The contiguous area (which would basically encompass the entire Virgin Mountains) has other resource values to consider.

Considering the entire area's current use and no indication of immediate heavy growth in recreation use, encumbering the entire area with a target toward recreational use would not serve the needs of the public nor fit into multiple use guidelines.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Develop an RAMP immediately.

Recommendation 1.4:
Develop and implement a Recreation Resource Monitoring System to provide protection through use supervision and to monitor the condition of the recreation-related natural resources present on the following areas. Evaluate their suitability for designation as natural environmental areas (botanical sightseeing) and complete designation, if warranted, by 1985. Develop an environmental assessment (EA) as the principal analysis tool.

a. Piute Valley--Joshua Tree Forest Proposed Natural Area
b. Cottonwood Cholla Proposed Natural Area
c. Potosi Barrel Cactus Proposed Natural Area
d. Paradise Valley Proposed Natural Area

Add appropriate protective stipulations to permits issued for the area to assure that the vegetation and the visual environment is not degraded.

Support Needs:
Designation, cadastral survey, multi-disciplined EA team.

Rationale:
All four areas have been identified in the URA as having outstanding botanical representation in an aesthetically-pleasing environment. Designation as natural areas or continued research to acquire additional information for determining the areas' potential as natural environmental areas (botanical sightseeing), and the use of protective stipulations would help preserve the unusual botanical qualities of these areas. The identified boundaries for designation are somewhat flexible as further surveys are needed to make sure the areas correspond closely with prime habitat.

Multiple Use Analysis

Principal conflicts with the protection of these resource areas comes from surface-disturbing activities such as construction, mineral operations, rights-of-ways, and fire. The recent upsurge in "cactus-napping" could also endanger the botanical areas. The four areas have been under a natural

(Recreation 1.4 continued)

area proposal since the prior MFPs in Stateline and Virgin Valley were published in the early 1970s. Being nominated but never evaluated and designation acted upon, can give management pause when considering other multiple use proposals for these areas.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written except complete evaluation and designation process by 1985.

Reason:
Unwarranted delay robs the areas of appropriate protection if they do rate it; it blocks other multiple uses if they don't.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
Drop from further consideration.

Recommendation 1.5:
Manage the 4,930-acre Virgin River Recreation Lands for their open-space, wildlife, and river-access values as they relate to recreation. Develop an information base for use in interpretive efforts and to gain a better understanding of the ecology and potential uses of the area. A reevaluation of the use should be considered during mid-life of this MFP (1985-86). If a significant increase in visitor use or demand has occurred, an RAMP should be developed for the area.

Support Needs:
All Divisions of the District staff as needed.

Rationale:
These Recreation Lands were designated in 1970 to preserve waterfowl habitat and rare and unusual plants along the Virgin River, with the plan of eventually developing wildlife and hunting values. The lands are presently receiving low use, but do assure the public access to the river for hunting, wildlife observation, and other recreational activities.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Recreation Lands are formally designated, but have a small use factor. They obviously provide an important recreation site to Virgin River Valley residents. As future constraints in travel grow, this area could become an important recreation site in Southern Nevada.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Continued management of these lands in accordance with their designation serves important recreational purposes in the Virgin River Valley and in Southern Nevada, now and in the future.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Withdraw designation.
2. Plan for development immediately.

Recommendation 1.6:
Manage the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands as set forth in the 1975 Environmental Impact Statement and the 1977 Master Plan. This plan serves in lieu of a BLM-prepared RAMP. Several major programs are focused on responding to the interests of the public, as well as to provide proper management of the 62,000-acre area. Phase in proposed sections of the Master Plan and the Visitors Services Plan as funding, staffing, and public demand warrant. Treat the Master Plan as an ever-changing dynamic tool.

See Table R-1.6 delineating the proposed activities and planned accomplishments for the RRCRL during the next five years.

Support Needs:
All District personnel, Nevada State Office personnel when needed, Nevada State Parks staff, and Denver Service Center staff (DSC) as needed, city and county agencies.

Rationale:
The RRCRL were designated in 1967. The present management philosophy grew out of broad public interest in an early master plan. All during the 1970s, as the EIS and master plan were prepared, public interest, Bureau direction, and local government continued to evidence strong support for recreational management of these lands. In 1979-80, controversy and public interest over proposed oil and gas leasing activities within the boundaries reaffirmed the direction of managing these lands as a prime recreation area, with few, if any competing uses.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 1.7)

The Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands (RRCRL) is an important recreation area, located only 10 miles from Las Vegas proper, that sees extensive visitor use throughout the year. Local residents feel strongly about maintaining this area solely as a recreation area. This was evidenced by the intense public interest and controversy generated over the oil and gas leasing recommendations made by the BLM in 1980. The Master Plan for RRCRL was developed in the early 1970s.

Acquisition of, as yet, undeveloped lands within and abutting the boundary of RRCRL would facilitate management of the area. These private lands are valuable for potential development due to their location, and acquisition by BLM would ensure that disrupting development on these private lands and subsequent destruction of the integrity of the recreational and aesthetic values of the RRCRL, would not occur.

(Recreation 1.6 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation: Accept the recommendation as written.	Reason: The RRCRL is a highly valued recreation area. Use other than that having recreational value would not be beneficial to the public or BLM.
Support Needs: As stated in MFP 1.	Alternative Considered: None.

TABLE R-1.6
RRCRL PROJECT SCHEDULE

FY81 -Interpretive Program Implementation
-Cooperative Management Agreement Working Plan (NDSP/BLM) Implementation
-Loop Drive Closure (after-hours)

FY82 -Trails Master Plan
-Update 1976 Master Plan
-Law Enforcement Cooperative Agreement/Contract and Working Plan
-Interpretive Prospectus
-Maintenance Program Implementation ('82-83)
-Brownstone Canyon Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Oak Creek Campground Design/Management Plan (NDSP)
-Full Operation of Visitor Center
-Environmental Education Program Implementation
-Initiate Summa Corp. Exchange (See R-1.7)

FY83 -Trail Design and begin Construction
-Implement Brownstone Canyon Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Red Rock Summit Road Management Plan/Decisions
-(NDSP)
-Sandstone Quarry, Pine Creek, White Rock Picnic Area Development
-Loop Drive Overlook Development (Fossil Dune, Sandstone Quarry, Whiterock)
-Loop Drive Seal/Chip Coat
-LaMadre Group-Use Area Development
-Land Acquisition/Exchange (Summa Corp).
-Backcountry Management Plan/Implementation

FY84 -Bicycle Trail Design
-Bootleg/Rainbow Springs Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Cave Area Management Plan
-Red Rock Summit Road Development (Lone Pine, Switchback, others)
-Oak Creek Campground Development (NDSP)

FY85 -Bicycle Trail Development
-Implement Bootleg/Rainbow Springs Cultural Resources Management Plan
-Cave Area Management Plan/Implementation

Recommendation 1.7:
Pursue negotiations with Summa Corporation to accomplish an exchange of private lands within and adjacent to Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands. The desired lands and their priority of exchange are shown below.

1. Sec. 7, T.21S., R.59E.,
   NE1/4, NW1/4, Sec. 18, T.21S., R.59E.
   N1/2, NE1/4, Sec. 18, T.21S., R.59E.
2. S.1/2, Sec. 19, Sec. 30, 31, T.20S., R.59E.
3. W1/2, Sec. 8, T.21S., R.59E.

Support Needs:

Lands, Appraisal

Rationale:
Acquisition of parcel #1 would protect the integrity of the approach to the recreation land. As it stands now, there is great potential for residential development of areas immediately adjacent to the Visitor Center, thus severely disrupting the aesthetic values inherent in the canyon.

Acquisition of parcel #2 would protect the highly-valued cultural resources in Brownstone Canyon.

Acquisition of parcel #3 would reinforce the benefits of parcel #1.

See Recreation 1.6 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.8:
Manage the 9,000-acre Las Vegas Dunes Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Play Area, a designated recreation lands, for its recreational ORV values. Prepare a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) for the Dunes in conjunction with a portion of the Dry Lake Valley ORV area. Complete RAMP (to include EA) during FY84.

Support Needs:
Multi-disciplinary Team.

Rationale:
The area was identified and designated in 1970 for its value as an ORV play area close to the city. The 1975 "Programmatic Environmental Analysis of ORV Use in the Dry Lake Valley Area" found the area suitable for such use. In 1980, the area became the location for a series of 15-20 annual motocross events. Every spring, the Mint 400 dune-buggy race crosses over this area and attracts some 15,000 spectators to the Dunes. Other individual and group use is also extensive.

The RAMP would not be lengthy, since major developments would not be required. Staff time in the area would increase slightly. Benefits would accrue, however, in the form of favorable public reaction and perhaps, increased use of the area. Use might be attracted to the Dunes, reducing pressure on the nearby areas of Sunrise Mountain and Rainbow Gardens. The exact boundary for the area would be determined as part of the RAMP process.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Watershed 4.4)

The Las Vegas Dunes is an intensively used ORV recreation area. The "MINT 400" ORV race course traverses the area. This is where the majority of the 50,000-60,000 spectators congregate. Casual individual ORV use is high, concentrated primarily on the weekends and during the fall and spring months. ORV clubs use the area frequently for club events. Sand dunes, by their very nature, are fragile watershed areas that cannot be rehabilitated due to low precipitation and very sparse vegetation. However, Watershed 4.4 supports ORV use in this area to offset soil degradation in more critical areas. An RAMP on this area would enhance its use by the public and provide better overall management.

(Recreation 1.8 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
See Multiple Use Analysis.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Undesignate to protect watershed.
2. Eliminate competitive and large group use.

Recommendation 1.9:
Protect and manage any and all resource values contiguous to the National Scenic Area identified by the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA), BLM, Riverside District on the California side of the state line. Initiate a study program to determine the potential expansion of the Scenic Area boundaries into Nevada. Add appropriate stipulations to permits issued for the area to protect the area from any distraction which might influence the California side.

Support Needs:
All Divisions of the District Office, the CDCA staff, and the Nevada State Office.

Rationale:
The National Scenic Area identified on the California side of the state line represents a unique botanical sightseeing area. The protection of the adjacent Nevada acreage is important to the integrity of the National Scenic Area. The study program will determine whether or not an extension of the project into Nevada is warranted.

The California area was designated through Federal Register Notice on January 16, 1981, under the authority of Sec. 601, P.L. 94-579 (FLPMA) and 43 CFR 8352.0-6.

Multiple Use Analysis

Existing uses in the contiguous area are not all of the type that are compatible with a designated scenic area. Several ORV races occur here each year. Mining interests have increased in the area. Currently, resources of the area appear to be able to sustain the existing uses. Designation of the area based solely on its being contiguous to a designated scenic area would prove to be controversial and not in the best interests of multiple-use resource management guidelines.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Initiate a study program to determine if any resource values in the contiguous area need special management consideration or protection. Until the study shows otherwise, follow current management practices.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Until a study of the area is complete and shows the need for protection against indiscriminate and undue resource damage or a need for special management consideration, it is necessary to manage the area under multiple use guidelines.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Manage the contiguous area as having outstanding scenic value.
2. Do not allow for a study of the area and manage area under current practices.

Recommendation 1.10

Oppose the designation of the the McCullough Mountains and the Frenchman Mountain-Rainbow Gardens area by the National Park Service, (Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service) as National Natural Landmarks.

Support Needs:

District Recreation staff and management decision.

Rationale:

Although the Clark County Ecological Profile identifies the areas as having some regional values, they do not possess national significance. The Spring Mountain Range does not qualify nor has it received any support for such a designation. The McCullough Mountains and the Frenchman Mountain-Rainbow Gardens areas are of relatively less value than the Spring Mountains and so would be less likely to meet national standards.

In addition, an RAMP is being recommended for the Frenchman-Rainbow Gardens area and Clark County is considering acquisition of it as part of the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park. Other MFP recommendations recommend protection of sightseeing values in the McCullough Mountains.

Multiple Use Analysis

The McCullough Mountains encompass two Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) (Recreation 7.1 and 7.2). They are also important habitat areas for wildlife, primarily bighorn sheep. These mountains are considered prime areas for botanical, zoological, and geological sightseeing (PAA).

The Frenchman Mountain - Rainbow Gardens area is an important geological sightseeing area. Clark County has identified this area for inclusion in their proposed Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park.

Both areas are important to local residents for various resource value reasons and, although they are considered to have regional values, they do not possess national significance.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:

See Multiple Use Analysis.

Alternatives Considered:

1. Allow designation to occur unopposed.
2. Oppose only designation of Frenchman-Rainbow Gardens area.

Recommendation 1.11:
Formally close the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands to livestock grazing.

Support Needs:
Range staff, Federal Register Notice.

Rationale:
The vegetation of the RRCRL is an important component of the recreational values which are the prime management objective for the RRCRL. Commercial harvesting of the vegetation by livestock would be incompatible with that objective. Moreover, grazing livestock would become involved in confrontations with recreationists, cause befouling of recreation sites associated with waters, and enhance the dangers of livestock-vehicle confrontations on the Scenic Loop Road and the Blue Diamond Road.

See Range Management 1.2 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 2.0:

Manage public lands in Clark County to maximize outdoor recreation opportunities. Ensure that management actions are not allowed that degrade, preclude use of, or deny access to principal recreation areas.

Rationale:

BLM lands in Clark County contain only a few developed or intensive recreation areas, although public input to the URA and PAA revealed that recreation use occurs virtually throughout the county. Other resource uses, such as mining and ranching, can cause conflicts with the recreation resource.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 directs BLM to manage recreation resources. BLM Manual 1603.12C2c acknowledges the BLM's role in environmental protection and specifically discusses the preservation and protection of natural values.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective is consistent with Bureau policy and Federal law (FLPMA, Sec. 102(a)(8)). It is supportive of responding to the great demand for dispersed outdoor recreation from Southern Nevadans.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 2.1:
Enhance prime horseback riding areas in Clark County through a combination of facility development and reduction of conflicts with other users. Cooperate with other agencies to maximize available resources.

(a) In Red Rock Canyon, implement the equestrian trail system identified in the master plan. Begin construction of the portion along the base of the escarpment in FY83. Coordinate efforts with the Nevada Division of State Parks.

(b) Cooperate with Clark County in developing a trail system for the Las Vegas Wash/Rainbow Gardens/Sunrise Mountain Area. Eliminate ORV use from designated equestrian trails. Sign and mark hazardous road crossings to protect equestrians. Schedule development according to the county's plan for developing the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park.

(c) Limit ORV use in the Spring Mountains to designated roads and trails, to eliminate equestrian-vehicle confrontations.

(d) Develop an equestrian trail plan in the Floyd R. Lamb State Park area with, and at the request of, the Nevada Division of State Parks.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, facility design, and construction, Clark Count Department of Parks and Recreation, Nevada Division of State Parks.

Rationale:
Horseback riding is a popular activity in the county as evidenced in the URA and PAA. Most use occurs in dispersed areas, and requires minimal management. The intensity of use, use conflicts, and demand for developed facilities in the previously mentioned areas, though, necessitates special attention. Clark County is taking an active role in meeting these needs in the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands Park plan. BLM should assist the county in these efforts.

(Recreation 2.1 continued)

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 2.2)

Horseback riding and hiking are popular with a large portion of the recreating public of Clark County. Hiking on public lands usually occurs in the mountainous areas. Private acreage available for riding or hiking is limited and cannot accommodate the growing demand for more horse or hiking trails. Urban expansion is adding to the recreation population while at the same time it is removing lands upon which these activities could occur unencumbered. Motorized vehicle activity on non-motorized recreational activity trails is unsafe and a nuisance. The extent of popularity of ORV activities in Clark County requires management to provide for areas where non-motorized activity can take place without hindrance from motorized vehicles, yet caution must be exercised in determining the extent of the area being restricted to motorized use.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written except for Recreation 2.1(c) and Recreation 2.2(c) and (d) which will be analyzed under Recreation 6.4.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Current use necessitates that the Bureau provide for enhancement of recreational potential and use in areas where user conflicts are becoming more acute, due to the ever-increasing population growth of a rapidly expanding urban area.

Alternative Considered:
Do not develop an equestrian trail near Floyd Lamb State Park.

Recommendation 2.2:
Enhance hiking opportunities in prime Clark County areas through a combination of facility development and reduction of conflicts with other users. Cooperate with other agencies to maximize available resources.

(a) In Red Rock Canyon, implement the hiking trail system identified in the master plan. Begin construction of the segments at the base of the escarpment in FY83. Coordinate efforts with the Nevada Division of State Parks.

(b) Cooperate with the U.S. Forest Service in developing trails in the Spring Mountains which tie into Toiyabe National Forest trails. Priority segments are the Red Rock to Charleston Peak trail (which would be designed and implemented as part of the Red Rock trail system) and the Mt. Stirling to Cold Creek/Willow Creek to Camp Bonanza Trail. Design of this portion should be in FY83.

(c) Limit ORV use in Red Rock and the remainder of the Spring Mountains to designated roads and trails to eliminate hiker-vehicle confrontations.

(d) Limit ORV use in the Muddy Mountains and the McCullough Mountains, North and South, to existing roads and vehicular trails to eliminate hiker-vehicle confrontations.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, facility design and construction, U.S. Forest Service, Nevada Division of State Parks.

Rationale:
The URA and PAA note that hiking is popular in mountainous areas in Clark County. Most use is dispersed and requires minimal management. The intensity of use and demand for developed trails in Red Rock and the Spring Mountains necessitates more intensive management. The Forest Service has an existing trail system on and around Mt. Charleston and has expressed interest in having BLM trails tie into this system.

See Recreation 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.3:
Manage the following areas for high value geological sightseeing opportunities. Utilize the expertise at UNLV in interpreting the geological significance of the areas.

(a) Gold Butte - allow individual ORV use throughout in conjunction with sightseeing. Develop interpretive signing by the mid-1980s.

(b) Sunrise and Frenchman Mountains/Rainbow Gardens - enhance sightseeing and related activities through the preparation of an RAMP (see Recreation 1.2).

(c) Gregory's Arch/Keyhole Canyon/Knob Hill - install interpretive signs, access trails, and semi-primitive day-use facilities, and prepare a brochure. Accomplish tasks incrementally through the 1980s.

(d) Muddy Mountains - insure access on the series of unimproved vehicular routes in the area.

Support Needs:
Division of Operations, Kingman Sign Shop, NSO graphics department, UNLV.

Rationale:
All of these areas represent interesting geological features to professionals and amateurs alike. The lack of vegetative cover and the proximity to Las Vegas make sightseeing opportunities readily available. Their visual values are important to the overall visual scope of the county. At the present time, these areas remain in a relatively undisturbed state.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6)

Sightseeing (geological, zoological, and botanical) and mineral and rock collection are popular activities in Clark County. The general lack of vegetation throughout the area makes geological sightseeing opportunities readily available. Much sightseeing occurs in conjunction with other recreation activities, e.g., hiking, camping, ORVing. Mineral and oil and gas leasing entry are increasing in the area. Access to selected sightseeing or collection areas is crucial to the occurrence of these activities. Population growth in the Las Vegas Valley has created an increase in these activities and the use of these areas.

(Recreation 2.3 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Current and future use necessitates that the Bureau provide for enhancement and protection of recreational potential and use where identified resource values occur.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 2.4:
Manage a variety of areas in Clark County for their value as wildlife observation areas for species of interest in the Mohave Desert. Assure that access is retained over BLM or county roads, and that new roads are not created unless absolutely necessary.

Support Needs:
None

Rationale:
User groups, such as the Sierra Club and Audubon Society, have identified these areas as fine to excellent for observing Mohave Desert wildlife.

Although use for such a specialized activity is at most moderate, wildlife observation values combine readily with other uses of the areas, such as hiking and individual ORV use.

TABLE R-2.4

Area	Species
Virgin Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep, mountain lion, mule deer
Virgin River Recreation Lands	Waterfowl
Las Vegas Wash	Waterfowl, raptors, songbirds
Eldorado Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep, wild burros
Cold Creek-Willow Creek	Songbirds, small mammals, wild horses and burros, mule deer, mountain lion
Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands	Songbirds, raptors, Desert bighorn sheep, wild burros
Newberry Mountains	Desert bighorn sheep

See Recreation 2.3 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.5:

Manage key areas in Clark County for their botanical sightseeing values. Insure that existing public roads are kept open and that entry to any of these areas is not restricted.

(a) Southern Potosi and Bird Springs Range - Contains very good stands of barrel cactus, prickly pear cactus, century plant, and other species representative of the Mohave Desert.

(b) McCullough Mountains South, including the flanks - contains high botanical values which include virgin stands of Mohave Desert vegetation.

(c) Newberry Mountains - Above the 3,500 foot elevation, manage to preserve botanical values. Coordinate with the National Park Service for visitor services and patrol in this moderately utilized area.

Support Needs:

National Park Service.

Rationale.

The URA notes that botanical values in Clark County are good to excellent. Not only the Mohave Desert, but also the Great Basin and Sonoran Deserts are represented. Botanical sightseeing is often included with picnicking, individual ORV use, hiking, and other activities. Protection of these areas from activities which would adversely impact the botanical resources will assure the continued enjoyment of this resource.

See Recreation 2.3 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.6:
Manage significant rock and mineral collecting areas so as not to exclude access for this purpose. Make sure existing public roads are kept open, and that entry to these areas is not restricted. Areas identified for such collecting are listed in Table R-2.6.

Rationale:
The URA notes that Clark County possesses an impressive variety of valuable rocks and minerals which are relatively easy to extract. According to the PAA, several rare and highly desirable collectibles attract enthusiasts from all over the country. Virtually all Clark County communities contain at least one rock and gem club. The primary management function to support this activity is insuring access to key collecting areas.

Support Needs:
None.

TABLE R-2.6

AREA	COLLECTIBLES	GENERAL DESIRABILITY
Goodsprings	galen, cerrusite, anglesite, fossils, feldspar	excellent
Eldorado Mtns. (Nelson area)	Chalcedony roses, agate, copper minerals	excellent
Searchlight & Newberry Mtns.	agate, lead and silver minerals	excellent
Sunrise Mtn., Rainbow Gardens, Lava Butte	fossils (trilobites), jaspar, agate, geodes	good
River Mtns.	amethystine nodules	fair
McCullough Mtns. North	amethystine, quartz, agate, chalcedony roses, jaspar	good
Crescent Peak (New York Mtns.)	unakite, epodate, obsidian, geodes, chalcedony, turquoise	very good
Dead Mtns.	quartz, feldspar, garnet	good
Muddy Mtns.	amethystine, jaspar, opal, agate	good
Arrow Canyon	fossils, including coral	good
Virgin Mtns. (Key West and Silverleaf Mine Area)	beryl, nickel, schist, hornblendite, quartz lenses, pyrites	good
Gold Butte	petrified wood, mica, selenite roses, corals, brachiopods, bryophytes	very good
North Muddy Mtns. and Overton Ridge	petrified wood, quartz magnesite	good

(Recreation 2.6 continued)

See Recreation 2.3 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 2.7:
Manage the following five sites for hang gliding. Ensure public access to these is kept open.

(a) Mt. Potosi
(b) Little Potosi
(c) Table Mountain
(d) Sloan
(e) Jean - determine the specific facility and development needs of this area as part of the Jean/Roach RAMP. (see Recreation 2.10)

Support Needs:
Division of Operations.

Rationale:
A small local club is the primary user group for this activity in the county. The primary concern at the five sites identified by them through the URA is retaining access to the take-off and landing areas. Jean, as the prime site in Southern Nevada, warrants a minimum level of improvements to enhance and facilitate use.

Multiple Use Analysis

Hang gliding is a relatively new sport that is enjoyed by a small group of enthusiasts. The nature of the sport requires an area where the hang glider can safely launch and land. Other pursuits occur around these areas, primarily mining and recreation. Some of these areas have communication rights-of-way on them. Access is available for these sites, while other suitable sites do not have access.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Hang gliding is a recreational activity that has a enthusiastic following and providing for management of areas for this activity to occur will not hinder other resource activities taking place in or near the general vicinity.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Identify additional sites.
2. Limit such use to the Jean area.

Recommendation 2.8:
Support the Nevada Department of Wildlife in their management and upgrading of hunting opportunities on a county-wide basis. Insure public access is maintained to the hunting areas identified below and any new areas developed for hunting. Deny competitive ORV permits in the following areas that rate good or excellent during the specific hunting season.

Support Needs:
Nevada Department of Wildlife.

Rationale:
The Nevada Department of Wildlife has the responsibility to manage wildlife. BLM's role is one of minimizing impact to wildlife and habitat, improving habitat, and maintaining access to hunting areas. Potential conflicts exist between hunters and ORV races.

TABLE R-2.8
HUNTING POTENTIAL

Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Highland Range	Bighorn Quail			
Spring Mountains		Bighorn Quail		Chukar Mule Deer
Eldorado Mountains		Bighorn Quail		
Bird Spring Range			Bighorn	
Searchlight Area		Quail		
Las Vegas Wash		Quail		Waterfowl
Newberry Mountains		Bighorn Quail		Mule deer
McCullough Range		Bighorn		
Castle Mountains			Bighorn Quail	
Moapa Valley	Quail	Waterfowl (private lands)		
Arrow Canyon Range		Bighorn		
Gold Butte		Quail		
Muddy Mountains		Bighorn		
Virgin River			Quail Waterfowl	
Virgin Mountains			Quail	

(Recreation 2.8 continued)

Multiple Use Analysis

Hunting is an important recreational activity enjoyed by a relatively small, but enthusiastic, portion of the recreating public. Access to most of the areas identified is good to excellent. Mineral and oil and gas leasing activity is occurring in the majority of these areas. In several of the areas, trailbike riding is a popular activity. Competitive ORV events currently occur in the Eldorado Mountains, Bird Spring Range, Searchlight area, Castle Mountains, and Moapa Valley.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Modify recommendation to read as follows: Manage the public lands and support the Nevada Department of Wildlife in an effort to upgrade hunting opportunities in Clark County. Ensure public access is maintained to the hunting areas identified in Table R-2.8 and to any new areas developed for hunting. Competitive ORV events will be managed on a case-by-case basis taking into account the hunting opportunity available in the area during the specific hunting season.

Reason:

Maintaining access to valued hunting areas is important. Competitive ORV events vary in nature and scope and denial of an event is best decided on a case-by-case basis until the Clark County ORV designation decisions are made.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:

None.

Recommendation 2.9:
Manage the Eldorado Valley for multiple recreation values. Re-evaluate in FY86 to determine if increased usage warrants development of an RAMP.

Support Needs:
Lands and Minerals.

Rationale:
This area, particularly the dry lake, is one of the most intensive recreation use areas in Southern Nevada. A multitude of recreation activities occur here. In 1979, eight ORV races attracted 2,000 participants and spectators. Individual ORV use is heavy. Several national model airplane events are held on the dry lake and two commercial aircraft companies offer rides. The dry lake has become a filming center for major motion pictures. Other uses include landsailing and powered hang gliders.

Transmission lines and surface disturbing actions such as seismic lines hamper recreation activities on and around Eldorado Dry Lake. If the State of Nevada does not exercise its option to purchase the Eldorado Valley by FY84, an RAMP should be strongly considered for this area at that time. In the interim, transmission line rights-of-way should not be approved any closer to the dry lake than the existing lines, and surface disturbing actions should not be authorized on the lake surface.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 2.10)

These valleys support a variety of recreational activities. Organized ORV competitive events occur regularly (eight in Eldorado Valley in 1979 and seven in Jean/Ivanpah Valley in 1979, involving a total of some 7,000 participants and spectators). Landsailing, powered hang-gliders, model airplaning, ORVing, commercial filming, commercial and individual still photography, camping, and commercial aircraft and glider rides are examples of the numerous and varied recreation activities that occur on the dry lake beds located in the valleys. Utility powerline rights-of-way traverse the valleys. Mineral entry, primarily in the form of sand and gravel pits, occur at various points throughout the valleys. The State of Nevada has an option to purchase about 105,000 acres in Eldorado Valley which they have not exercised to date. Boulder City and Clark County are considering locating a new airport in Eldorado Valley.

(Recreation 2.9 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
These valleys, and especially the dry lake beds (playas), are immensely popular recreational areas. Special management consideration is required to ensure that user conflicts are minimized or alleviated.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Manage recreation in these areas on a par with other resource uses.
2. Give priority to utility lines.

Recommendation 2.10:
Manage the Jean Valley/Ivanpah Valley area for multiple recreation values. Re-evaluate in FY86 to determine if increased usage warrants development of an RAMP.

Support Needs:
Lands and Minerals.

Rationale:
These valleys, which include two dry lakes, support a variety of recreation activities. In 1979, seven ORV races attracted some 5,000 participants and spectators. Such prominent races as the Las Vegas 400 and SNORE 250 are held here. An international land-sailing regatta, powered hang gliders, and a company that offers commercial aircraft rides use the dry lakes. The PAA identifies a hill near Jean Dry Lake as the premier hang gliding site in Southern Nevada.

In 1980, a local recreation group made a proposal to the Nevada Division of State Parks to manage parts of this area as a regional recreation park to manage the above-mentioned activities as well as camping, hunting, and sightseeing. Though this proposal was thought to be premature by some at the time, it may warrant strong consideration in the late 1980s as the Clark County population continues its rapid growth and rising energy costs keep recreationists closer to home.

Use conflicts exist in the form of utility line corridors encroaching on the dry lakes and seismic line and other surface-disturbing activities marring the lake surfaces.

See Recreation 2.9 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 3.0:
Cooperate with and support other agencies' efforts to provide increased outdoor recreation opportunities, and/or access to existing recreation areas, on their lands and on adjacent public lands, for urban residents and visitors alike.

Rationale:
Other agencies can provide recreation opportunities to complement and enhance those provided by BLM. Different agencies have different skills and management level capabilities which, when combined with BLM's, produce better opportunities for the public. In the past, cooperative efforts have enhanced management of the Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands.

Data cited in the PAA on recreation needs and the county's growth, the energy crisis and the financial woes of most public agencies, strongly indicate the need for pooling resources and concentrating on opportunities close to metropolitan areas.

FLPMA and recent BLM policy statements encourage this kind of cooperation. In addition to increasing the supply and quality of opportunities, coordination can channel use to areas where it is desirable, and away from environmentally sensitive, hazardous, or otherwise inappropriate areas.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective supports the concept of interagency cooperation and providing service to the public by combining the strong points of the different agencies. It supports the "good neighbor" policy and would receive wide public support.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 3.1:
Develop by FY84 a cooperative agreement with the Nevada Division of State Parks (NDSP) which would identify:

1.) Long range cooperation
2.) Recreation goals and objectives between the two agencies.

Provide buffer zones of open space around existing State Parks: Valley of Fire and Floyd Lamb. Maintain space for eventual equestrian trail corridors from Floyd Lamb State Park to the Desert National Wildlife Range, and from Valley of Fire State Park to the Buffington Pockets area of the Muddy Mountains.

Maintain open space corridors along the routes identified in the Nevada Statewide Trails Inventory for the Basin and Range Cross-State Off-Highway Vehicle Trail, the Las Vegas Wash Trail, the Las Vegas Valley Recreation Trail, and the Red Rock Canyon Excursion Trails and Staging Points. Work with NDSP to define and refine these corridors, and to discuss mutual goals, problems, etc.

Support Needs:
District Recreation Staff, Management, NDSP.

Rationale:
The Division of State Parks has requested that BLM consider their desires for buffer zones and trail corridors leading onto public lands; recreational values do not cease at political boundaries. Development of trail systems between points of interest will increase recreation opportunities and help satisfy demands identified in the SCORP and URA.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 3.2)

Cooperation is generally excellent with neighboring government agencies with recreational responsibilities. Formalization of this spirit in a cooperative agreement would be helpful. A more positive long-range effort to be explored would be cooperation on specific recreational projects which would allow expertise and land/recreation managing abilities to come together and focus on a specific area.

(Recreation 3.1 continued)

Corridors and buffer zones create immediate and difficult-to-resolve conflicts with other uses, i.e., mineral exploration (Minerals 1.1) and livestock grazing (Range Management 1.2).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendations as written except do not provide buffer zones or maintain corridors free of other uses unless the managing recreation agency requests a Recreation and Public Purposes Act disposal of the land.

Reason:
Cooperation on specific projects among agencies is excellent and in the public interest. Buffer zones and holding of corridors open amount to de facto segregation of public lands, which is contrary to Federal regulations.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 3.2:

Develop a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Clark County, to develop projects such as the bicycle trail through RRCRL along county and BLM rights-of-way by 1986. Other potential areas for cooperation include equestrian trail corridors or day-use facilities around outlying towns.

Support Needs:

All agencies included above. Nevada State Office Recreation staff.

Rationale:

Cooperation between agencies will provide better recreation opportunities for the public and allow BLM to support local governmental agencies who can provide opportunities complementary to BLM's.

See Recreation 3.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 4.0:
Provide visitor safety and resource protection on all public lands in the county. Cooperate with local agencies for those services which BLM is not able to provide.

Rationale:
Potentially hazardous conditions exist in the form of unmarked mineshafts, flash flood areas, and wildfire hazards, to name a few. Needless tragedies occur because of public unfamiliarity with potential hazards. Tort claims have been filed against BLM in the past as a result of accidents to recreationists on public lands. Bureau policy and regulations require authorized officers to provide for safety of visitors. Protection of recreation resources from wildfire and other kinds of misuse are required if opportunities are not to be lost.

BLM does not have the means to provide all the services needed to protect visitors and the resources; therefore agreements with other agencies must be established, along with communications networks for the rapid transfer of information.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective is consistent with Bureau responsibilities to the visiting public with respect to safety. It is consistent with FLPMA (Sec. 303).

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 4.1:
Educate the public to hazards such as flash floods, wildfire, desert survival, and open mineshafts, which are associated with the county's public lands. Brochures, safety messages in interpretive programs, TV spots, public service announcements, and news releases should be utilized. In some cases physical barriers should be provided.

Support Needs:
State, County, and City agencies, District Recreation and Operations staffs, Public Affairs Officer.

Rationale:
Although most hazards are part of the natural and man-made environment, many people are simply not aware of them, and don't know how to avoid them. Children can be particularly susceptible to them. BLM must be concerned about threats to the well-being of visitors to public lands and facilities.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 4.2)

The identification and mitigation of hazards which affect public safety are standard procedures provided for through current regulations. Education of the public in regards to hazards is important and information concerning these hazards should be made readily available for the prudent individual and concerned public.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written, except eliminate the five-year completion target in Recreation 4.2 and complete the task as funds and personnel are available.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
Multiple use resource management guidelines as outlined in the regulations provide for public safety consideration.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Map, but do not mitigate ORV hazards.
2. Mitigate hazards only in high use areas.

Recommendation 4.2:
Identify, map, and mitigate, within five years, all potential hazards to ORV recreational users.

Support Needs:
Lands and Minerals, Division of Operations, funds.

Rationale:
Hazards (i.e., mineshafts) on public land require mitigation to keep the Bureau out of possible litigation procedures. The U.S. Government has been sued and an out-of-court settlement favorable to the plaintiff was made by the U.S. Attorney's Office regarding two motorcyclists killed when they rode into an unmarked mineshaft on an abandoned mining claim.

See Recreation 4.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 4.3:
Provide law enforcement in high use recreation areas, particularly the RRCRL, through whatever means are available to the BLM. Consider cooperative agreements with qualified agencies, such as Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department or Nevada Division of State Parks. If law enforcement authority is given to BLM, agency personnel should immediately be trained.

Priority areas for law enforcement needs are:

1.) RRCRL
2.) Red Springs
3.) Cold Creek/Willow Creek
4.) All other areas

Develop and pursue a contract and/or cooperative agreement with the following agencies to enforce State and local laws:

1.) Metropolitan Police (Sheriff)
2.) Nevada Division of State Parks
3.) Nevada Division of Forestry
4.) Nevada Division of Wildlife

Support Needs:
State and county law enforcement personnel. Cooperative agreements, BLM criminal investigator, Recreation staff.

Rationale:
Some of the problems, violations, and other situations occurring on BLM lands in the county are severe enough to require the presence of personnel with full law enforcement authority. This is particularly true in the RRCRL. BLM personnel are not trained, do not have authority to act, and risk great personal danger in attempting to deal with these situations. Therefore, situations are ignored which should receive law enforcement attention. Examination of case-incident files will reveal the types of situations. The most cost-effective method for solving these problems would be BLM law enforcement officers. Barring that, reliance will have to be placed on other agencies.

Multiple Use Analysis

RRCRL, Red Springs, and the Cold Creek/Willow Creek areas are high use recreation areas. Incidents of criminal and other acts occur relatively frequently, especially in RRCRL. Federal regulations prohibit dangerous and disruptive acts but do not provide for enforcement of these same regulations. Current use in these areas requires trained personnel to enforce pertinent laws.

(Recreation 4.3 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
Incidents requiring law enforcement occur all too frequently in high use recreation areas. Until such time as law enforcement authority is given to BLM personnel, it is necessary to have cooperative agreements with qualified agencies to enforce Federal, State, and local laws.

Support Needs:
State and county law enforcement agencies. Cooperative agreements, BLM criminal investigator, and Recreation staff.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 4.4:
Coordinate with the Sheriff's Jeep Posse and Metro Special Operations Unit to provide search and rescue operations for climbers, hikers, and other recreationists on public lands. BLM personnel should also receive training and be able to handle many situations.

Support Needs:
RRCRL staff, District Recreation staff.

Rationale:
This group of people is fully trained in search and rescue operations, and should be called for all situations which BLM personnel are unable to handle.

Multiple Use Analysis

The intensity of use on public lands in Clark County is high and incidents requiring trained search and rescue personnel have occurred in the past and will most likely continue to occur. BLM personnel trained in search and rescue techniques are few. Time is of the essence when attempting search and rescue of individuals.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
RRCRL staff, District Recreation staff, and the District Safety Officer. All activities.

Reason:
Current use on the public lands demands that needed search and rescue operations be timely, efficient, and effective. The Sheriff's Jeep Posse and Metro Special Operations Unit are organizations of which one of their primary functions is search and rescue.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 4.5:

Prepare, or bring up to date immediately, fire suppression plans for recreation areas, taking into account where the greatest threats to human life and property are, where recreation values would be destroyed through loss of native or special vegetation, and where direct or indirect hand suppression techniques should be applied.

The following is a list by priority of the recreation areas currently needing protection:

1.) RRCRL
2.) Cold Creek/Willow Creek - Wheeler Wash/Mt. Stirling
3.) Lovell Canyon
4.) Remaining Spring Mountains
5.) Virgin Mountains/Mormon Mountains
6.) South McCulloughs

Support Needs:

District Recreation staff, Fire Management Officer.

Rationale:

BLM policy currently is to suppress all fires. Priority should be given to areas where human lives or property are at stake. The Spring Mountain Range, including Red Rock Canyon, is identified in the URA and PAA as a critical recreation area requiring special management. High visitor use, expensive improvements, and unique recreational values make effective fire suppression there imperative.

See Fire 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Objective 5.0:
Manage the public lands in the Spring Mountains as a primary recreation area for residents of Southern Nevada. Cooperate with private landholders and other agencies as needed.

Rationale:
Over one-half of the State's population resides within a one-hour drive of the Spring Mountains. Numerous studies cited in the URA and PAA indicate a great need for more campgrounds, picnic areas, and places to "get away from it all," particularly around Las Vegas where crowding and summer heat cause great numbers of residents to travel to the mountains for recreation. The sharply rising cost of energy may cause Clark County residents to look more often to local areas to satisfy their recreational needs.

The BLM is capable of meeting many of these recreation needs through existing programs and within current policy constraints. Recent surveys by District personnel indicate that use is becoming too heavy to proceed under the concept of dispersed recreation in this mountain range.

Improving facilities and management will accomplish two things: the need for recreation will be better met, and the resource can be better protected from misuse and degradation. The Spring Mountains are being impacted by overuse, wildfire, and development of private land. The PAA states that all or most of the range may be a Critical Environmental Area.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Ecological Profile for Clark County identified the Spring Mountain Range as "substandard" because of its great susceptibility to environmental degradation through the many human uses found there. With its nearness to Las Vegas, it is apparent the demand for recreational use will continue to grow. It is not a demand that can be put off. If it is not directed and controlled, the resources will certainly suffer, to the detriment of all, including the recreationist.

Establishing recreation as the primary resource use on the Spring Mountain Range would certainly curtail other resource uses. Mineral exploitation and its inherent surface disturbance would be hampered by this objective. Vegetation manipulation programs for other resource purposes would be subordinated to a degree. Wildlife and its habitat would certainly be impacted by the increased human use encouraged by implementing this objective. The list goes on into virtually every other resource program.

The undisputed fact remains, however, that the impacts will occur. Las Vegans cannot be kept from the mountain. BLM, if it attempts to react negatively to the recreational use impacts with restrictions and use denials, has neither

(Recreation 5.0 continued)

the personnel nor the enforcement clout to make negative management actions stick. On the other hand, positive recreational management that accommodates and channels the recreational use demands will both meet the challenge and minimize the impacts on the other resource uses present.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Modify the objective as follows: Manage the public lands in the Spring Mountain Range primarily for the recreational values there. All other resource plans and programs will be coordinated with and subordinated to the recreation program. Cooperate with private landholders and other agencies as needed.

Recommendation 5.1:

Prepare a series of RAMPs on critical use areas for gradual development of the Spring Mountains to serve as a major recreation area for Southern Nevada. Within 10 years develop an overall master plan for recreational uses on the mountain range. The goal should be to maximize the recreation experience for the number of visitors the resource can tolerate. Type of use would vary from location to location but should include the following: overnight camping, picnicking, day-use activities such as historical sightseeing, certain kinds of ORV use, hiking, and other compatible activities as deemed appropriate. Current uses, such as mining, grazing, and forest products harvesting would not be restricted, but recreation would become the major use in these mountains. Overall, developments would be at a relatively low level. Since trailers and RVs are extremely popular, some provisions for them should be made. For the most part, roads should remain unpaved, campgrounds small, and facilities simple. Users should be expected to carry out their own trash, especially from remote areas.

Coordination with the Toiyabe National Forest, Mt. Charleston District, and public participation should be included in this planning project.

Support Needs:

Planning requirements can be met by existing District staff. Implementation will probably require increased staffing, which may be accomplished through eight or nine-month temporary appointments.

Rationale:

The URA, PAA, SCORP, and numerous other sources address the shortage of recreation resources in Southern Nevada. The PAA further identifies the Spring Mountains as a critical environmental area because heavy use, man-caused fires, and private developments are causing severe resource impacts. The Ecological Profile describes the Spring Mountains as moderately susceptible to change agents. Managing the area for recreation and directing use to desirable locations are the best methods to counteract these problems.

Multiple Use Analysis

The Spring Mountains lie close to a major metropolitan area that is rapidly expanding. These mountains have been identified as an extremely important recreation area, especially to local residents. The Spring Mountain Range

provides a mountain retreat for escape from the populated valley. During the summer, they are the closest place available to get away from the valley's oppressing heat. Some of the current uses in the mountains include camping, picnicking, sightseeing, trail-bike riding, hiking, hunting, ORVing, and horseback riding. The Forest Service has facilities available, but these are proving to be limited and overcrowded. This overcrowding has generated an increase in recreational use of BLM administered lands in the Spring Mountains (PAA).

In addition to the PAA identification of the range as a major recreation destination for Las Vegans, the Ecological Profile identified the range as "substandard" because of the great actual and potential impact on its ecological systems through uncontrolled human use. It is clear that the use pressures for recreation will continue. Equally clear is that without control and direction of that use, the natural resources of the mountain range will be severely degraded. The Mack Canyon Fire (June 24 - July 2, 1981) was caused by an escaped campfire. It cost the Bureau and the Forest Service some 6,400 acres in excellent forested recreation lands. In addition to that catastrophic type of degradation, the ordinary pressures of multiple use, as described below, also have the real potential of overloading the natural system's capabilities to handle use impacts.

Firewood gathering (dead and down) is allowed to occur here, and current use areas are not actively defined. The demand for firewood/greenwood cutting is growing and, considering the resources available for this activity, it is necessary to identify cutting areas and monitor cutting (Forestry 1.1, Wildlife 1.30). Unsupervised cutting and gathering could have strong impacts on watershed and vegetation values. Losses in these areas could severely impact recreational uses by degrading the environment in which recreation takes place. In the extreme, uncoordinated woodcutting could actually destroy the value of a facility such as a campsite or picnic area.

The Spring Mountain Range currently has active grazing on four of its seven allotments: Kyle Canyon, Lucky Strike, Younts Springs and Wheeler Wash. The unallotted-ungrazed allotments are Spring Mountain, Wheeler Slope, and Roses Springs (Range Management 1.2, Livestock Grazing 1.4). Continued grazing would provide some conflict with recreational uses in terms of confrontations between recreationists and livestock. From a sightseeing point of view, grazing livestock could add to the recreational experience. More direct impacts could arise from uncoordinated fencing that blocks off recreational areas, water developments that conflict with campgrounds, and the like.

Leaving the ungrazed allotments ungrazed (Wildlife 1.7, Recreation 1.11) would eliminate the confrontation possibilities (and the pastoral/western scenes) as well as enhance wildlife values which would improve recreation from the hunting and animal photography perspectives. It would also encourage the development of the forest-brush type of plant communities as opposed to the grass-brush communities desirable for livestock grazing.

These mountains support, in varying density populations, numerous wildlife and raptor species. Hunting occurs in the mountains, but other recreational use, intense and extensive throughout most of the range, has created a situation where public safety and user conflicts are becoming an important issue (Recreation 2.8, Wildlife 1.11, Wildlife 1.13).

(Recreation 5.1 continued)

In addition, the increased human use of the mountains for recreation could cause increased displacement of wildlife species intolerant of human activity (Wildlife 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6).

Private/patented land is scattered in plots throughout the area and unintentional trespass, user conflicts, and fire threat exists (Fire 1.4).

Development of recreational facilities on public land near private land might be opposed by landowners who perceive public use as impinging on the privacy and naturalness required for enjoyment of their mountain retreats. A very real possibility of such conflicts exists in the Cold Creek area, albeit warnings were given about the potential conflicts at the time private development plans were approved.

Off-road vehicle use occurs on the numerous roads, trails, and washes located in the range, and trail-bike riding occurs in those areas where the terrain is conducive to it (Wildlife 1.9, Recreation 6.4). ORV use in some areas may be incompatible with other recreational uses. On the other hand, off-road vehicles are essential to acquire access to some of the more rugged recreational areas without extensive road building. Use supervision is particularly important in the latter case to assure the access without a buildup of an extensive, unplanned network of ORV trails which could cause long-range watershed and vegetation damage.

Part of the range is traversed by utility rights-of-way, serving established use areas on the upper regions of the mountain (Lands 3.0). As additional development occurs, both of public recreational facilities and private lands, additional utility lines will be needed. Planning and control is needed to avoid unnecessary impacts on visual and vegetation resource values.

Wild horses are present in most of the higher elevations of the range (Wild Horses and Burros 1.1). Burros inhabit some of the lower elevations in the southeast and southwest areas of the range. These animals enhance the recreational experience from a sightseeing perspective. However, overuse of springs and riparian habitat, which is not uncommon with these animals, can degrade those areas for human use. Overuse of vegetation resources, by all animals including horses, can adversely affect the recreational values in the mountains.

A large portion of the area is under mineral lease or lease application for oil and gas. Some areas of the range have historic or active mining districts (Minerals 1.1). While minerals activities can cause both long- and short-term adverse impacts to the recreational use, opportunities exist in the "plan of operations" review stage to mitigate or avoid those conflicts.

Several areas of the mountain range are under study for possible wilderness designation. That current activity (Recreation 7.2) and the restriction on development in those areas pending a designation decision by Congress (Recreation 7.1) is supportive of non-motorized recreational activities.

The recent (June 24-July 2, 1981) fire at Cold Creek raises the question of whether that should continue to be the first RAMP developed. On one hand, the destruction by fire would make that area less desirable for recreation. On

(Recreation 5.1 continued)

the other, the proposed boundaries do include Willow Creek and the Wheeler Pass area, which were not affected. Proceeding with the RAMP now would also provide protective action to the burned area during its rehabilitation.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written. All resource activity planning in the Spring Mountain Range above the 5,000 foot contour is to be coordinated with and subordinated to recreational plans. (See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for a revised RAMP schedule.)

Support Needs:
U.S. Forest Service, all resource activities, NSO and DO recreation staff.

Reason:
The proposal, while ambitious, is responsive to the use demand which can be expected. In responding positively to projected demands prior to their full weight hitting the agency, the Bureau will be able to accommodate uses in a reasonable manner rather than having to react negatively and deny or prohibit uses until plans can be made.

Alternatives Considered:
1. Continue balanced multiple use activities.
2. Give RAMP priority to Kyle Canyon/Lee Canyon over Cold Creek/Wheeler Wash.

R-5.1-1 Recommended approximate boundaries for each RAMP area is as follows:

Area	Boundaries
Cold Creek/Wheeler Wash:	North - 5,000' elevation and Mt. Stirling WSA East - 5,000' elevation South - Wallace Canyon West - Boundary of Mt. Stirling WSA
Trout/Lovell Canyons:	North - Toiyabe National Forest East - RRCRL boundary South - Pahrump highway West - Wallace Canyon
Kyle/Lee Canyons:	North - North boundary of Desert View N.A. East - approximately 5,000' elevation South - boundary of LaMadre Mountains WSA West - USFS boundary
Mt. Potosi:	North - Pahrump Highway (S.R. 161) East - Cottonwood Pass road South - Wilson Pass road West - Approximately 5,000' level

R-5.1-2 Phase in RAMPs as use pressure warrants; a recommended time table follows:

Area	Begin Planning	Begin Implementation
Cold Creek/Wheeler Wash	FY 83	FY 84
Trout Canyon/Lovell Canyon	FY 84	FY 85
Mt. Potosi	FY 84	FY 86
Kyle Canyon/Lee Canyon	FY 85	FY 87

R-5.1-3 In all RAMP areas, the following items must be assured:

(a) Assure that access to the area exists on BLM or County roads. Easements over private roads should be considered only if no alternative exists.

(b) Determine potability of surface waters throughout RAMP areas; provide drinking water in Cold Creek, Willow Creek, and Wheeler Wash areas, and elsewhere if feasible.

(c) Coordinate with other resources which will affect the RAMP areas - hunting (wildlife), wilderness, watershed, range, and so forth, so that multiple-use values are retained.

Objective 6.0:
Manage recreational off-road vehicle (ORV) use on public lands in Clark County by providing a spectrum of opportunities ranging from individual, casual travel to highly organized competitive events.

Rationale:
The recreational use of ORVs is recognized by BLM as a valid activity on public lands. Clark County has one of the highest ORV use levels in the nation when compared to other areas of similar size and population density. ORVs allow a large part of the population, who would otherwise not be able to physically reach isolated areas, to enjoy the natural environment. The use of motorcycles to sightsee and reach remote areas is becoming more popular.

Executive Order (EO) 11644, amended by EO 11989, directs the Secretary of the Interior to designate areas and trails on public lands as either open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicle use. The popularity of ORV use among residents of the county, its rapid growth, the terrain suitability for cross-country ORV travel, and the "wide-open spaces" typified by most of Clark County, all indicate an increasing demand for ORV use areas within the county.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is consistent with current Bureau policy. It is responsive to the widespread demand among the Southern Nevada public for recreational opportunities on the public lands that involve or require off-road vehicle usage.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 6.1:
Develop and institute a monitoring program for the entire county which would catalog the specific effects of different ORV uses on resources present. Implement the program during FY84.

Support Needs:
Soils, Watershed, Range, and Forestry programs.

Rationale:
To determine the suitability of areas to support or sustain a certain amount of ORV use, data relative to the number of ORVs in an area and the resources impacted needs to be collected and analyzed. In the future, the data accumulated would provide the Bureau a certain amount of flexibility to adjust management use decisions as the need arose. Use monitoring will allow the Bureau management flexibility by providing data as to seasons of use, and will help reduce visitor conflicts.

Multiple Use Analysis
(Includes Recreation 6.2 and 6.3)

Current off-road vehicle use in Clark County -- individual, organized, competitive, and noncompetitive -- is extensive and intense. The population increase in the county will generate an increase in ORV use, both recreational and other. Certain areas are used more intensively than others, depending upon the type of ORV use involved. As ORV use continues and increases, the resources impacted need to be studied through a monitoring system.

Many individuals feel recreational ORV use is an important part of their recreational pursuits. Controlling individual ORV use on BLM administered lands requires intensive management. Providing designated areas where individuals and families can enjoy a recreational ORV experience would serve to mitigate undue resource damage in other areas.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
All activities and programs, Nevada Division of State Parks.

Reason:
Off-road vehicle use in Clark County is increasing as the population grows, and a need is present to study the effects of ORV use on resources in specific areas. Considering the popularity of recreational ORV use in Clark County, it is important to provide suitable areas for individuals to pursue their ORV sport.

Alternative Considered:
Allow for implementation of an ORV use monitoring program but do not allow for determination of suitable ORV recreation areas.

Recommendation 6.2:
Within 3 years, define and determine suitable areas for the following:

a. Motorcycle Trail Systems Park(s): these would be designed for individual, family, and small group use, providing both point-to-point and closed loop sightseeing trails with day use and overnight camping opportunities.

b. ORV Play Area(s): This would be designed for individual, family, and group use, providing day-use areas and overnight camping facilities.

c. Motocross Park(s): This would have one or more closed-loop course areas and provide for adequate spectator areas.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
ORV use continues to be a popular pastime in Clark County and appears to be on the rise. As use continues to increase, areas that now see intensive ORV use will undoubtedly be used more extensively and the resources of these areas might not be capable of sustaining this increased ORV demand. Providing additional ORV areas can help reduce unnecessary degradation of the natural environment, reduce conflicts with private landowners and authorized land users, and serve to keep ORV recreationists from being exposed to hazards. Supplying the ORV user with areas to use would help to provide a safer, more enjoyable recreational experience.

See Recreation 6.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 6.3:
Provide for a portion of a cross-state trail for ORVs from the Las Vegas Dunes area through Meadow Valley Wash, then north to the Pony Express Trail.

Support Needs:
All activities.

Rationale:
A portion of a cross-state trail (Basin and Range Trail) as envisioned by the Nevada Division of State Parks (see Division of State Parks Memo dated 25 May 79; subj: Issues and Planning Summary, Clark County BLM MFP) would involve public lands. Development of this trail would offer an excellent recreational experience for family-oriented ORV groups. The use would be constructive and provide opportunities for environmental education which would aid in resource protection.

See Recreation 6.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 6.4:
Formally designate, during FY83, the county as to ORV use. Designate the county as "open" to ORV use, with the exception of the following areas, which would be designated as "limited":

a. Eldorado Mountains south of Knob Hill and north of the St. Louis Mine: elevation 4,000 feet and above.
   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles: existing roads, trails, or washes.
   2. Two-wheeled vehicles: trail riding authorized except on the Ireteba Peaks.

b. Las Vegas Valley: All vehicles.
   1. Existing roads.
   2. No competitive events unless authorized by the city or a county governmental agency.

c. McCullough Mountains south of McCullough Pass: elevation 5,200' and above.
   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles: existing roads, trails, or washes.

d. McCullough Mountains north of McCullough Pass: elevation 3,200' and above.
   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles: existing roads, trails, or washes.

e. Spring Mountains: that portion located between the Pahrump Highway and U.S. Highway 95 at 6,000' and above:
   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles: existing roads, trails, or washes.

f. Arrow Canyon Range: elevation 3,200' and above:

Rationale:
Recreational off-road vehicle use is an extremely popular sport for many people in the county. The "wide open spaces" and its accessibility are important to the vast majority of residents. Remote and isolated areas can often times only be reached by ORVs. The area's harsh climate and lack of available potable water sources make it almost mandatory to carry an adequate supply of water while out recreating, and to do this often requires the use of some type of vehicle. Most of the county has terrain characteristics (low vegetation in a sparse density, broad expanses of relatively flat land, and few large rocks) which encourage cross-country ORV travel and provide for scenic trail-riding access. Currently, the resources of the county appear to be able to sustain the amount of unrestricted ORV use occurring and, even with the estimated population increase projected, the estimated increase in ORV use does not point to undue or unmitigatable resource impacts.

Executive Order 11644 (37 CFR 2877, as amended by EO 11989) requires all public lands to be designated either "open," "limited," or "closed" to ORV use.

Rationales for limitations in specific areas are shown below:
(a) the terrain severely limits cross-country ORV travel;
(b) population density and this valley being part of the Air Quality Nonattainment Area require limiting ORV travel;
(c) the terrain limits cross-country ORV travel and the resources here

(Recreation 6.4 continued)

   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles:
      existing roads, trails, or washes.

g. Overton Corridor: All vehicles.
   1. Existing roads or trails.

h. Virgin Mountains: elevation 6,000' and above.
   1. Three or more wheeled vehicles:
      existing roads, trails, or washes.

i. Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands: All vehicles.
   1. Designated roads.

necessitate limiting ORV travel for three or more wheeled vehicles;
(d) the terrain is such that cross-country ORV travel is severely limited;
(e) this area is an intensively used recreation area and indiscriminate ORV use can cause serious conflicts between users;
(f) the terrain severely limits cross-country ORV travel;
(g) this is a populated farming area requiring limitation of ORV travel;
(h) the terrain is rugged and limits cross-country ORV travel;
(i) this designated recreation land sees intensive recreational activities and indiscriminate ORV use causes serious conflicts between users.

Competitive, commercial, and organized events of 50+ vehicles are to be regulated through the Special Recreation Use Permit (SRUP) Program as defined in 43 CFR part 8372.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Lands 3.4, Watershed 3.2, and Wildlife 1.3, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, and 3.4)

Several different resource recommendations are in conflict with ORV use.

Wildlife 1.3 - Bighorn Sheep

- Restrict competitive ORV use to roads, trails, and washes in all habitat.

- No competitive events:
  January 1-April 30 in lambing habitat;
  May 1-September 30 in crucial summer habitat;
  November 15-December 15 in habitat in hunting season.

- No competitive events in historic range for three years following reintroduction.

Wildlife 1.7 - Game Birds

- No competitive events within a half-mile of waters in crucial quail or chukar areas.

(Recreation 6.4 continued)

- Limit competitive events to existing roads, trails, and washes from .5 to 1.5 miles of waters in crucial areas.

- Limit noncompetitive use to roads, trails, and washes within a half-mile of waters in crucial areas.

Wildlife 1.8 - Mule Deer

- No competitive events within 1.5 miles of yearlong water from May 1 to September 30.

- Limit competitive and noncompetitive use to existing roads, trails, and washes in all deer habitat.

Wildlife 3.4 - Desert Tortoise

- No competitive events in crucial habitat.

- Limit competitive events in non-crucial habitat to existing roads and designated trails and washes.

- No competitive events in non-crucial habitat during the active period from March through September.

Watershed 3.2

- No competitive events within a quarter-mile of water sources.

Watershed 4.5 - Soils

- On soil areas with "severe" SSF and "critical" SSF plus high erosion hazard, limit recreational ORV use to existing roads and trails.

- On soil areas with "critical" SSF plus medium/low erosion hazard, and "moderate," "slight," or "stable" SSF plus high erosion hazard, limit organized or multi-vehicle use to existing roads and trails.

Wildlife 1.10 - Non-Game Birds/Gila Monster

- No ORV use in or within a quarter-mile of important desert wash habitat.

Recreation 1.6 - Red Rock Canyon

- Close to off-road vehicle use.

- Limit vehicles to designated roads and trails.

(Recreation 6.4 continued)

Recreation 2.1 - Horseback Riding

- Limit ORV use to designated roads and trails in the Spring Mountain.

- Close designated horseback riding trails in Las Vegas Wash/Rainbow Gardens/Sunrise Mountain to ORV use.

Recreation 2.2 - Hiking

- Limit use in Red Rocks and Spring Mountain to designated roads and trails.

- Limit use to existing roads and trails in Muddy and McCullough Mountains.

Recreation 2.8 - Hunting

- No competitive events in listed areas during hunting season.

Complementary recommendations are:

Lands 3.4: Maintain access to existing withdrawals, leases, rights-of-way, private lands, etc.

Minerals 1.2: Don't prohibit vehicular access to known mineralized areas.

Recreation 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8: Assure that access to the dispersed recreation areas discussed remains available on existing BLM, county, or State roads.

Fire 1.5: Maintain access for fire equipment on Wheeler Pass Road, Lovell Canyon Road, Old Pahrump Highway (88), and Red Rock Summit Road.

Recreational use of ORVs is a major public activity in Clark County. it also is of commercial importance for livestock management, wildlife habitat work by agencies, mineral exploration, etc. The ORV-related industry plays a major service role in the Southern Nevada economy.

Although the lands have never been formally designated, Clark County public lands have been managed for ORV use under MFP 3 decisions for "open," "closed," and "restricted" use areas since the mid-1970s. Those decisions were made with public involvement. A 1980 effort to develop designation orders based on those MFP 3 decisions was unsuccessful for a number of reasons. The public agreement made then was to designate in FY83 through this planning process.

There are three basic designation tools available: open to ORV use, closed to ORV use, and limited ORV use. The latter offers a number of options relative to types of vehicles, types of events, seasons of use, areas of use (roads, trails, or washes), etc.

(Recreation 6.4 continued)

Multiple Use Recommendation:
(temporary)

Develop, through an FY82 public participation effort and EA, a recommended, specific designation of public lands in Clark County as open, closed, or limited to ORV use.

Reason:
As stated in Multiple Use Analysis.

Support Needs:
Public Affairs, all activities.

Alternative Considered:
Use 1974-75 MFP 3 decisions as basis for designation.

Objective 7.0:
Protect Wilderness Study Areas within Clark County to maintain potential suitability for inclusion into the National Wilderness Preservation System, until such time that Congress designates them as wilderness or releases them from further wilderness consideration.

Rationale:
With the passage of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the Bureau was mandated to inventory and study all public lands for possible inclusion into the National Wilderness Preservation System by October 21, 1991.

A wilderness experience has a unique recreational value. Such specialized recreational values should be preserved and made available for education and enjoyment of the general public. The preservation of wilderness areas will enhance the quality of life for succeeding generations. The loss of these areas would result in the loss of environmental factors that have contributed significantly to the cultures of the past and to the experiences of the present publics.

Multiple Use Analysis

This objective conforms with requirements of law and Bureau policy.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 7.1:
Manage Clark County within the guidelines of the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review so that wilderness characteristics of these lands remain until such time as the areas are included into the National Wilderness Preservation System or are released from further consideration by Congress.

Support Needs:
All Divisions of the Las Vegas District Office.

Rationale:
The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 states that the Bureau of Land Management will manage their lands on the basis provided by the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review until such time that the land has either been cleared from further study or has been designated into the National Preservation System. This interim management provides continued use of the land while studies are being made. It will be the impact of an activity on the land and its effect on the wilderness potential, not the activity itself, that will determine whether this use is to be allowed to continue or to be regulated while wilderness reviews are being made.

Multiple Use Analysis
While some resource uses conflict with wilderness, e.g., mineral exploitation, the Interim Management Policy forecloses any management discretion to significantly alter the natural appearance of a Wilderness Study area except for valid existing rights and grandfathered activities associated with grazing, mining, and mineral leasing.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason
As stated in the Multiple Use analysis.

Alternative Considered:
None

Recommendation 7.2:

Complete the study phase of all Wilderness Study Areas and make recommendations to the Secretary on all suitable and nonsuitable study areas found within Clark County by December 31, 1985.

Support Needs:

The maximum available manpower will be required to complete the wilderness study phase on the county.

Rationale:

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 mandates that all public land will be inventoried and recommendations will be made from the findings for possible inclusion into the National Wilderness Preservation System by October 21, 1991.

Multiple Use Analysis

This scheduling is determined by Bureau policy and is not subject to District management discretion.

Multiple Use Recommendation:

Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:

As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:

As stated in the Multiple Use analysis.

Alternative Considered:

None

Clark County

Cultural Resources

CR-1

Objective 1.0:
Significant cultural resource properties on public lands in Clark County will be subject to one or more protection and/or stabilization measures. An adjunct of protection is the limitation of off-road vehicle (ORV) activity in certain sensitive areas.

Rationale:
BLM Manual 8100 acknowledges the Bureau's responsibility to manage cultural resources on public lands. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976 also mandate protection of important archaeological, historical, and scientific values.

Protection and stabilization are two key components of the Bureau's cultural resource program. Protection can be accomplished in a variety of ways including such physical protection methods as signing, barriers, enclosures, and gates. Stabilization is accomplished through various physical measures which negate natural forces affecting a site.

Limitations on ORV activity in sensitive areas will protect cultural resources from physical damage the vehicles can cause and eliminate or curtail "pothunting" and other degrading activities encouraged by ready access to important sites.

Multiple Use Analysis

The objective is consistent with Bureau policy and conforms with its responsibilities under a variety of laws.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the objective as written.

Recommendation 1.1:

Develop Cultural Resource Management Plans (CRMPs) for the Muddy Mountains, Willow Springs, and Brownstone Canyon by the end of FY85. Plans would include the installation of physical protective devices in conjunction with restriction of ORV use to existing roads, positive protection signing, and the establishment of interpretive trails.

Support Needs:

Materials for physical protective devices, trail construction, and interpretive signs.

Rationale:

Members of the Archaeological Research Center at University of Nevada-Las Vegas, have identified the Muddy Mountains, Brownstone Canyon, and Willow Springs as possessing high cultural values. Site types representative of the areas include rock shelters, roasting pits, rock art sites, and open sites. Preliminary patrol efforts through he areas indicate that vandalism in the form of uncontrolled ORV use and illegal excavation activities are of immediate concern. BLM Manual 8100 acknowledges the Bureau's responsibility for protection of cultural resources on public lands. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976 also mandate protection of important archaeological, historical, and scientific values.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.2:
Nominate the Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns to the National Register of Historic Places during FY83.

Support Needs:
National Register nomination, withdrawal.

Rationale:
Inclusion of this historic property in the National Register would provide further assurance that no action would be initiated that would threaten the historic quality of this important resource. This property is eligible for National Register nomination as defined under 36 CFR 800.10, as the property contains valuable research data which can greatly enhance our understanding and awareness associated with historic settlement of the Las Vegas area.

Multiple Use Analysis

(Includes Cultural Resources 1.3)

The nomination and evaluation process involved in listing sites on the National Register of Historic Places and for designation as National Historic Landmarks does not, in itself, conflict with other activities. Being designated would protect such sites from surface-disturbing activities which might endanger them. Conflicts could then be engendered with such activities as mineral leasing, competitive ORV events, and so on. The sites selected, however, are relatively small (or linear) and mitigation by avoidance would be relatively simple.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
If the sites named warrant the protection, based on the evaluation process, it ought to be granted.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.4:
Develop tests for and install interpretive signs for the Willow Springs Archaeological loop trail. In addition, develop an interpretive trail-head brochure keyed to the various interpretive stations placed at strategic points along the trail.

Support Needs:
Materials and cultural resource personnel.

Rationale:
Interpretation of cultural resources encompasses management, public, and professional needs. Interpretation complements protection by raising the public's awareness and concern for cultural resources. It is only through increased public awareness that we will fully achieve protection of our cultural resources and support for those programs which foster interpretation/protection. Hundreds of prehistoric sites on public lands could be interpreted for the public, not simply to "point out" these sites, but to increase public awareness and concern for these properties.

Related to the interpretation recommendation is the professional community research orientation and focus concerning cultural resources.

The BLM as a land managing agency is in a unique position to guide research on public lands in such a manner that problem-oriented research provides data useful to management, the public, and the scientific community.

Multiple Use Analysis

There are no conflicting recommendations to this suggestion. It is complemented by Recreation 1.6 relating to management of Red Rock Canyon Recreation Lands. This recommendation would have positive recreational values to persons using the Willow Springs area and could contribute to a "protection by education" effort for all cultural resource values.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Rationale:
The recommendation is positive recreation and cultural resource management.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.5:
Preserve a representative sample of line shacks, mining cabins, and other isolated historical structures. Document and preserve isolated graves on public land.

Support Needs:
To be determined.

Rationale:
Some of these properties may have historical significance and none should be destroyed until fully assessed. Others are not particularly old or significant when considered individually, but collectively they relate to ranching and mining. Those two industries have dominated the history of Southern Nevada and it is important to preserve physical properties which relate to those lifeways.

National policy codified in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-515), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, calls for preservation of historic sites including those of State and local significance. This recommendation implies inventory, since most of these kinds of sites have not yet been inventoried.

Multiple Use Analysis

Several activities, such as mineral entry, ORV use, and other surface disturbance activity could conflict with this recommendation. However, the isolation and uniqueness of such sites should make mitigation by avoidance relatively easy. A preservation program such as this would offer positive social and educational benefits to the people of Southern Nevada regarding their heritage.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written.

Reason:
This is a beneficial program having minimal conflicts with other resource uses.

Support Needs:
Inventory, stabilization, protection.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.6:
Evaluate the following areas for designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern:

1. All high probability areas identified on URA Step #3 Overlays for each of the two planning units.

2. The Old Spanish Trail and environs.

Support Needs:
All other resources.

Rationale:
The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579) defines Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and affords those areas special management consideration. Interim guidance further refines the definition and management implications. The relation of each of the two categories in this recommendation to relevance, importance, criticalness, and protectability is discussed in the URA. Basically, the categories are as follows:

1. High probability areas have highest potential for fragile archaeological resources and are also areas in which adverse impacts are most likely to occur.

2. The Old Spanish Trail and its environs are of regional and national importance, which clearly requires special management consideration.

Alternatives Considered:
Evaluate only some of the above described areas as ACECs. Nominate as ACECs areas with high potential (item 1 above) which are also in potential conflict with other uses (e.g., recreation areas, areas of intensive mining, oil and gas areas, areas classified for disposal, etc.).

See Forestry 2.1 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.7:
Identify the following historical sites for special protection from fire:

- Mt. Potosi Cabin
- Wheeler Pass Charcoal Kilns
- Searchlight Mining District
- Virgin Mt. Cabin
- Goodsprings Mining District
- Mt. Potosi Mines
- Trout Canyon Cabin
- S. McCullough Wickiup
- Crescent Peak Mining District

Support Needs:
Fire control decisions.

Rationale:
Those sites are of historical interest and warrant preservation. Each of these sites also includes flammable elements which are threatened by range fires.

National policy codified in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1969, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 calls for preservation of historic sites including those of State and local significance. In addition, some of these properties may qualify for the National Register of Historic Places. Under 36 CFR 800.3, neglect of a National Register property is an "adverse effect." Rejection of this recommendation, therefore, would require a lengthy review by the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

See Fire 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.8:
Initiate regular and systematic patrols of specific areas and/or sites containing high cultural resource values. Site types to be patrolled on a priority basis include rock art sites, shelter cave sites, and historic sites with architectural features, as identified on the URA Step 3 Cultural Resources Sites Overlay and in the BLM Archeological Site records.

Support Needs:
Development of an adequate cultural resource ranger program, budget, law enforcement authority.

Rationale:
The Clark County URA identifies numerous cultural sites which are continually suffering from various forms of vandalism. The BLM 8100 Manual states: "the Bureau shall protect by the most effective means under its authority" sites which have archeological or historical values. Cultural rangers and other trained personnel provide a means of on-the-ground supervision. A cultural ranger patrol program which emphasizes the continual photographic monitoring of cultural resource sites and other protective measures, can help meet this responsibility, as demonstrated by the California Desert Ranger Program.

Multiple Use Analysis

No other recommendations conflict with this recommendation. It would add a needed measure of protection to high value cultural resource sites. A principal constraint is the available manpower and funds to accomplish the task.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept the recommendation as written with the provision that patrolling for cultural resource protection is to be accomplished in conjunction with other resource field work by DAT-trained personnel .

Reason:
While the intent is laudable it is unlikely additional cultural resource patrol personnel will be assigned.

Support Needs:
Coordination with all field personnel; site visitation schedule development.

Alternative Considered:
None.

Recommendation 1.9:
Develop and implement Cultural Resource Management Plans (CRMPs) on a site-specific basis as archeological or historical resources are discovered.

Support Needs:
To be determined as sites are discovered.

Rationale:
Information needed to adequately assess significance is presently lacking for most sites. Such an assessment is essential in deciding how to handle conflicts and in establishing priorities for preservation work. The problem is serious, since National Register eligibility determinations are required by 36 CFR 800.4 prior to any action which may affect cultural resources. For some sites, implementation of this recommendation will imply inventory to determine whether or not the site is unique or unusual in an area. For some historical sites further archive research will be required. Some archeological sites may need test excavation to establish whether or not buried deposits are present. Specific measures for specific sites and area will be designed under CRMPs.

See Livestock Grazing 1.4 for multiple use analysis and recommendation.

Recommendation 1.10:
Determine sources of deterioration and priorities for preservation through field evaluations of all cultural resource sites.

Support Needs:
Cultural resource personnel.

Rationale:
Many sites in our present inventory were recorded years ago by entities other than the BLM. Condition and trend information is lacking for most of those sites. Those data are badly needed for determining where problems occur and what further action is required. Implementation of this recommendation will consist of visiting the sites to identify erosion, trampling, vehicular use, vandalism, or other factors which are contributing to resource deterioration. This recommendation also implies further inventory, since only a fraction of the cultural resource sites in the Clark County area have been identified.

The Antiquities Act, NEPA, Executive Order 11593, and FLPMA clearly direct Federal agencies to conserve cultural resources. Moreover, many properties in Clark County may qualify for the National Register of Historic Places. Under Federal regulations (36 CFR 800), neglect of such properties, resulting in deterioration or destruction of the property, is an adverse effect. An adverse effect requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Multiple Use Analysis

No other recommendations conflict with this. Determination of such sources of deterioration are essential to an effective stabilization and protection program.

Multiple Use Recommendation:
Accept recommendation as written.

Support Needs:
As stated in MFP 1.

Reason:
As stated in Multiple Use Analysis.

Alternative Considered:
None.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225